HOW I BECAME A NON-CATHOLIC

JOHN HUNKEY

252

E. M. Patterson

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/howibecamenoncat0000john

How I Became A Non-Catholic

THAT being the making of the discovery that the Catholic Doctrines of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, are Erroneous and Unscriptural.

By

JOHN HUNKEY

Cincinnati, Ohio
The Standard Publishing Company
1911

Copyright, 1911,
THE STANDARD PUBLISHING CO.
All rights reserved.

PREFACE

As a sort of a defense as to how I became a non-Catholic and left the Catholic Church, and by reading various works of Catholics, and converts to Catholicity, such as "Why I Am a Catholic," "How I Became a Catholic," etc., I was inspired to write a work giving some of the reasons *how I became a non-Catholic.* For I was "born and bred" a Catholic and was a practical one up to the thirty-sixth year of my age, so that some Catholics, including some of my relatives, have expressed great surprise that I, an "ignorant and illiterate person," should leave the Church—a short form I will use for the words "Catholic Church"—when intellectual giants, highly educated, wealthy, cultured and refined people are Catholics, or Protestants and others, after a lifetime of Protestantism and investigation, oftentimes near the end of their lives, become converts to Catholicity. They have even gone so far as to say that I had lost my mind, had become crazy, was in the power of the devil, was stubborn, proud, etc.

In view of that, then, I believe some sort of a defense or explanation should be made of my course or action for becoming a non-Catholic and leaving the Church.

Although there are a number of doctrinal reasons for how I became a non-Catholic, I will give but two

of them; for to give them all would make too large a volume. I will, as it is, even have to leave out matter pertaining to the two doctrines to be examined, otherwise it would make too large a volume. The two doctrines are the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, virtually the two leading or essential doctrines of the Church. And when one arrives at the point where those two doctrines appear to one as errors, not pronouncing them anything stronger here, it is sufficient, or ought to be, to cause one to leave the church that teaches these doctrines. And that is what I did when I thought I could expediently do so. For had I not then left the Church I would have become a hypocrite had I outwardly continued to profess belief in doctrines when I could no longer give to them "an internal assent of the intellect," as one is obliged to give to the teachings of the Church, as may be seen by this:

From these passages (Matt. x. 14; xviii. 17; Mark xvi. 16), we see, on the one hand, that the Apostles and their successors have received full powers to announce the Gospel; and on the other, that their hearers are obliged to listen with docility, and to obey not merely by an external compliance, but also by an internal assent of the intellect (The Faith of Our Fathers, 48th Edition, James Cardinal Gibbons, pp. 89, 90).

The Church says the following of the Eucharist or the Communion bread and wine:

The holy Eucharist is the body and blood, soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the appearances of bread and wine, or of either of them (A Catechism of the Catholic Religion, approved by Louis Mary, O. S. B., p. 74).

It is the central dogma of our religion and the very focus of Divine love (Thoughts for All Times, Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan, p. 119).

The most important doctrine in the whole of Catholic the-

ology . . . The keystone of Catholic worship . . . The center of religious faith (The Sacramental Life of the Church, Rev. Bernard J. Otten, S. J., pp. 79, 101.

A Eucharistic mission (among Protestants) is a revelation to such as these, because it shows them how all the dogmas of our holy faith come to a focus in the Real Presence (The Winchester Conference. Papers by the Missionaries to Non-Catholics on the Work of Making Convents, October, 1901, p. 58).

The Catholic ritual which, be it observed, never ceases, for its center is the Real Presence. In this everlasting Sacrament, the unknown God, if we believe, is not far from every one of us (The Prospects of Catholicism, Rev. William Barry, D. D., p. 23).

In a word, this Sacrament is, as it were, the very soul of the Church (God with Us: Letter from Pope Leo XIII on the Most Holy Eucharist, p. 23).

Here is what the Church says about the Blessed Virgin:

The cultus, or worship, of the Virgin Mary forms an essential part of the Catholic system (A Short Cut to the True Church, Rev. Edmund Hill, p. 119).

The Church exhorts her children not only to honor the Blessed Virgin, but also to invoke her intercession (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 221).

It may be seen, then, by what the Church teaches about the Eucharist and the Blessed Virgin, that the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin are virtually her two leading or essential doctrines.

Where, then, a church's two leading doctrines are erroneous, have no bases of truth, that is the church or religion one ought to and should leave when one makes the discovery that they are erroneous, otherwise one would become and be a real hypocrite.

This work is not to be criticised from a literary or a

grammatical standpoint; for I am not a graduate of any institution of higher learning.

JOHN HUNKEY.

ATCHISON, KANSAS, in the year 1910.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	How long Christ remains present with communicant—Transubstantiation changes bread and wine into pre-existing body of Christ—Christ not speak in the literal sense—Jews misled by repetition of Christ's words in John 6th	1
II.	Word "is" stands for signifies—Christ received under each species—Multiplicity of Christ-Gods—God goes into the stomach of communicant—His blood flows in our veins—Withdraws His presence when species fail to digest	18
III.	Priests should heal the sick—Catholic communion is cannibalism—Christ forgave sins as man—The Scriptural way of having the abiding presence of Christ—God laid upon your tongue—How be guilty of body and blood of the Lord—Communion of infants	43
IV.	The difference between to enter the kingdom of God, and have life in you—The church changeable—No warrant of Scripture for frequent communion—Christ speaks of baptism to Samaritan woman—Soul reached and fed through the mind	86
V.	Spirit received by the hearing of faith—John 6th not teach Real Presence—Christ came to abolish idolatry—His to be a spiritual kingdom—Not speak figuratively at Last Supper—Fathers who ate manna in the desert, in hell or else annihilated	114

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. Chalice of benediction, blood of Christ—Apostles not believe in Real Presence—Host of pagan derivation—Efficacy of communion—Catholic sacraments not supernatural—Popes usually Italians—Catholics fear criticism of conduct by Protestants..... 151

VII. Laws of yearly communion and attendance at mass on Sundays—The confessor the judge how often may go to communion—Penances imposed as Christ would impose if still on earth—Difference between accidents and substance—Mass only a make-believe. 195

VIII. What it means to put on Christ—Infallibility of the Pope—Catholics not pay to have sins pardoned—If the church erred, then Christ has lied—Pope has host placed in tomb with him—Church, with wisdom of ages, knows more than you—Truth not prerogative only of institution with wisdom of the ages 227

IX. Invocation of the Blessed Virgin—B. V. is only a creature—Cannot hear over 46,000 petitions simultaneously—Behold thy son, limited to St. John—Drink ye all of it, limited to clerics—Christ not say, Woman, behold thy daughters..... 263

Conclusion 300

Appendix 308

Index 318

How I Became a Non-Catholic

CHAPTER I.

The way I was led to the discovery of the error of the doctrine of the Real Presence—which is a short form I will use for the words "Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, or Communion bread and wine"—was as follows: About twelve years ago, in the thirty-sixth year of my age, I became physically afflicted in such a way that I could not do anything else much since that time than read for pastime. In my much reading I re-read the Catechism, which I had been taught in my youth when my mind was not mature enough to do much, if any, thinking for myself on religious doctrines; and read other Catholic works, some of which were given me by priests while I yet lay bedfast. In reading again the Catechism and other Catholic literature I came across the following:

Q. How long does Jesus Christ remain under the species?

A. As long as the species exist (Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. Stephen Keenan, p. 230).

Q. How long does Christ remain present with His Sacred Flesh and Blood?

A. As long as the appearances of bread and wine continue to exist (Deharbe's Catechism No. 1, p. 260).

Christ remains present under the appearances of bread and wine no longer than the material appearances remain; once

they cease because of digestion, or from any other cause, the presence of Christ ceases also (Question-Box Answers, Rev. Bertrand L. Conway, p. 447).

After receiving the Most Holy Sacrament our Divine Lord dwells in us and remains until the natural heat destroys the appearances (Magazine, Perpetual Adoration, 1905, p. 7).

Yet one ought to pray as follows after receiving Communion:

May Thy Body, O Lord, which I have received, and Thy Blood, which I have drunk, remain with me (The Mass Book, Rev. A. P. Doyle, p. 27).

But it seems Christ pays more attention to the communicant's "digestion" and the "natural heat" of his stomach than to his prayer, if Christ takes His departure as soon as the "species" have "ceased because of digestion" or been destroyed by "the natural heat" of the stomach of the communicant. There is, then, a difficulty here, is there not? The Church says further:

Beg Him to abide with you all day . . . Remember that away from Communion, there are but alternations of courage and weakness; but real strength, indomitable strength, is the portion of those in whom Jesus Christ always abides (Frequent and Daily Communion, Father Julius Lintelo, S. J., pp. 48, 56).

But how can Christ abide with or in the communicant "all day" or "always," if He takes His departure as soon as the "species" have "ceased because of digestion," which the Church says is about "ten or fifteen minutes" after receiving Communion?

Oh! how precious are the moments immediately after the reception of holy Communion. For ten or fifteen minutes *at least*, as long as the appearances of bread remain unchanged within us after holy Communion, we should be absorbed in fervent devotion (A Pious Preparation for First Holy Communion, Rev. F. X. Lasance, p. 339).

Now, if Christ's presence ceases "ten or fifteen minutes" after the reception of Communion, "because of digestion" or destruction by "natural heat" of the "species," then how can Christ abide with or within one "all day" or "always," if it is only by Communion that one can obtain or have His presence with one? Think of that question again. Is it not a difficulty and a contradiction?

After reading that the presence of Christ ceases as soon as the "species" have ceased "because of digestion," etc., and pressing the inquiry a step further than the Church went, or "digging a little deeper," as Rev. Patrick Denehy says (Who Can Forgive Sins, p. 3), logically the following question suggested itself:

What, then, becomes of Christ after the "appearances of bread and wine no longer continue to exist" after the reception of Communion, when the "natural heat" has caused the "species" to "cease because of digestion"?

For surely a new and "whole and entire" Christ or God is made at the consecration at Mass, according to the following:

After the consecration, which the Priest makes by saying over the bread and wine the same words which Jesus Christ said at the Last Supper, there is no longer any bread and wine on the altar, but the true and living Jesus Christ (The Mass Book, Rev. A. P. Doyle, p. 7).

By a word the omnipotence of God changes bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. The substance of bread and wine is annihilated, but notwithstanding this, the appearances remain in their original state and retain their taste, color and form (Magazine, Perpetual Adoration, 1908, p. 2).

See the power of the Priest; out of a piece of bread the word of a priest makes a God. It is more than creating the world (Magazine, Tabernacle and Purgatory, May, 1905, p. 13).

(See the power of the Priest; by the word of a priest the

sick are made well. It is more than creating the world out of nothing (?) The first claim has as much truth to it as the last.)

The Council of Trent says (Sess. xiii, ch. iv): "That by the consecration of bread and wine a change is wrought of the bread's whole substance into the substance of Christ our Lord's Body, and of the wine's whole substance into the substance of His Blood, which change has been by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called Transubstantiation." . . . Transubstantiation, therefore, means that when Jesus Christ, at the Last Supper, pronounced the words, "This is My Body; this is My Blood," the Son of God, by His omnipotent power transubstantiated, or changed, the substance of the bread and wine into His living flesh; so that no bread or wine whatsoever remained, but Himself—Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity, under their appearances. So in like manner, every day at Mass, the priest, acting in the name of Christ, pronounces the same words, and God effects the same change. . . . Transubstantiation has an analogy in nature, imperfect though it may be. For is not the human body, which changes entirely every few years, made up of the food we have assimilated? Does not at least a part of this food become body and blood? Why believe in this gradual, mysterious change that God works in us constantly, and deny Him the power of instantly changing food into His Body and Blood? (The Question-Box Answers, Rev. B. L. Conway, pp. 416, 417, 436).

A better analogy, I believe, is an egg, whose entire changeable substance can be changed into a living chicken.

According to the foregoing quotations a new Christ-God, with a separate ego, mind, will and consciousness, must be made at every consecration at Mass, who begins existence where the substances of bread and wine cease to exist, are changed into Christ-God, just as a new chicken, a new ego, if such a term may be applied to it, begins existence where the substance of an egg is changed into a chicken. Transubstantiation does not mean an

infusion of Christ-God into substances that afterwards still remain, as the wire remains after electricity has been infused into it, or without displacing the substance of the wire, but is a complete changing of one substance into another, like the changing or transmuting the substance of an egg into a living chicken. And, of course, where one substance is thus changed into another, the substance that succeeds it must then necessarily have its beginning, just like a chicken has its beginning where the substance of an egg is changed into it, there being just as complete a change of substance and a beginning of existence in the one case as in the other. That is what real transubstantiation means. A God, then, who is made "out of a piece of bread" is not the uncreated, infinite and eternal God from eternity who is. It is, then, only a "God" to those who want to believe so, just as the man-made god of wood or stone of the pagans is "a god" to those pagans who want to believe so. Then think of worshiping such "a God!" What, then, is the real difference between Catholic idolatry and pagan idolatry, so far as their deities in material forms and their adoration are concerned? Answer for yourself.

When one substance is changed into another, and it does not start the beginning of a new being, as when food is changed into natural flesh and blood of a being already in existence, then it adds to the size or quantity of the being into which it is changed, or they replace wasted tissues. But that thought can not be held of God. For He is infinite and can not, therefore, be added to nor waste away; for infinitude admits of no increase or addition or wasting tissues. To say, as one wrote me, that "the Christ is in all consecrated Hosts, mysteriously diffused," and when the "material appearances have ceased because of digestion" that then "Christ Himself

is undiminished," would not be transubstantiation, but consubstantiation, in which the Church does not believe. Neither would Christ then have been "consumed," as Catholics are led to believe is the case when they "eat the flesh of the Son of Man" in Communion. And according to the following there is after all no real transubstantiation, but the Eucharist is a sort of a magnet that draws the Lord from heaven:

In Transubstantiation the substance is changed, not so as to form what till then had no existence, but into that which already exists. That is to say, before the consecrating words are spoken our Lord's sacred Body exists in Heaven, perfect, entire and wanting in nothing, and by virtue of the words of consecration the bread resting on the altar is changed, not into a new Body, but into that very pre-existing Body. [Must, then, add to its size or quantity]. The Body into which the substance of bread is changed in the Mass is a glorified Body—a true body indeed, possessing all its constituent parts and organs, but spiritualized, incorruptible, immortal and glorious. This doctrine refers only to Masses offered up since the time of our Lord's Resurrection (Thoughts for All Times, Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan, p. 145).

According to that there is really no transubstantiation at the consecration, but a sort of a case of "now you do, and now you do not" change bread and wine into such flesh and blood of Christ as the Jews apparently believed they were to eat and drink, and into such flesh and blood as Christ had at the time He said to them:

Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you (John 6:54).

And how can bread and wine be changed into "that very pre-existing Body" that is "entire and wanting in nothing," without adding to its quantity, just like bread and wine changed into human flesh and blood, or body,

can not help but add to the quantity of the body, or replace its wasting tissues? And will glorified bodies have flesh and blood such as the Jews apparently believed they were with the mouth to literally eat and drink? If so, then how does that dovetail with this?

Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God (I. Cor. 15:50).

And if it was not literal, carnal flesh and blood, but glorified flesh and blood—which is no such flesh and blood at all as understood by the Jews, and which they were to literally eat and drink—then how was the declaration of Christ (John 6:54, 55), if it meant a mouth-eating and drinking act, anything but misleading to them, especially if the following is true?

That He is not speaking figuratively, but in the literal sense, about our eating His flesh and drinking His blood is proved by His frequent repetition of "unless a man eat My flesh and drink My blood he shall not have life in him." And when the Jews objected to this doctrine as repugnant, far from telling them it was figurative language, He repeated His statement and allowed them to depart (The Gospel Plea for Christian Unity, Rev. Martin O'Donoghue, p. 42).

Did not the repetition of "unless a man eat My flesh and drink My blood," make the flesh and blood as literal and carnal as the repetition of "Except a man be born again" (John 3:3-5), make the water mean literal, carnal water? Or did it also mean a "glorified" water, under the veil of something as foreign in appearance to literal water as bread is to the supposed literal flesh and blood of Christ?

Probably if Christ had, if He meant a mouth-eating and drinking operation, explained, as the Church has, and told the Jews He did not mean literal, carnal flesh

and "clotted gore" such as they bought "in the shambles of the meat market" (The Real Presence, Rev. C. F. Smarius, S. J., p. 9), as they imagined Christ would give them, but that He would give them a "glorified Body" under the veils of bread and wine, which would be as easy to eat and drink as plain, natural bread and wine, they probably would not have thought it to be an operation or "doctrine as repugnant" and would then not have said: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" (John 6:53). Either, then, Christ misled the Jews, if He meant a mouth-eating and drinking act at all, but which He did not, as we will see later, or else the Church is in error for claiming now that the flesh and blood of Christ are to be understood as "glorified" flesh and blood; for at the time He addressed the Jews it was before "the time of our Lord's resurrection."

That the Jews, however, understood they were to eat and drink flesh and blood that were flesh and blood "indeed" (John 6:56), in their literal or carnal state, may be inferred from the following:

> If we take the expression, to eat the flesh of Christ, in the only figurative sense known at that time, and say that was His meaning, His words, reduced to literal language, would stand about thus: "Except ye do some grievous injury to the Son of Man, ye have no life in you." This interpretation must at once be rejected; and this being true, we are forced to take its expression in its literal sense, or in some new and unknown and undefined figurative sense. And what right have we to do the latter? . . . And to show that these expressions (John vi. 54, 55) were revolting to the Jews, I need only refer to the following texts: Levit. iii. 17; vii. 26; Gen. ix. 4; Deut. xii. 16; xv. 23; Levit. xvii. 10; I. Kings xiv.; Eze. xxxiii. 25; Judith xi. 10-12; Wisdom xi. 7; Isa. xlix. 26; Jer. xix. 8; Acts xv. 29. It was doubtless this revolting idea which the Jews had of eating human flesh and drinking blood, that induced many of the disciples to "walk no more" with our Lord, and disbelieve the

doctrine He taught (The Path which Led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church, Peter H. Burnett; Rev. Jas. Sullivan, S. J., Ed., pp. 286-288).

The Church, however, does not strictly "take its expression in its literal sense," but the sense in which she takes it would make Christ's "language stand about thus:"

Except ye eat the glorified Body in Heaven of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you.

Now, if the declarations of Christ were not to be taken in the plain, literal, obvious sense, as pagans literally ate and drank the flesh and blood they "sacrificed to idols" and "from things strangled" (Acts 15:29, etc.), then were the Jews not misled by those declarations if those declarations meant that His flesh and blood would be of the "glorified" kind and were to be received under the veils of bread and wine? Even as the Church has interpreted it, it is not in "its literal, plain, obvious sense," which was supposed to be the only other sense than the figurative sense, which "must at once be rejected." If the Jews, then, were not misled then there must be a real transubstantiation of bread and wine into carnal, literal flesh and blood of Christ, such as was His flesh and blood at the time He spoke to them, at least they must appear so to the eyes of faith. Transubstantiation, then, means the coming into existence of a substance that has a beginning where the substances of bread and wine end, and means a new substance or being, just as a chicken hatched from an egg is a new substance or being, and at the consecration at Mass it must then mean a new and "whole and entire" Christ-God. Or if no new Christ-God is made then at least new flesh and blood of His are made, and new flesh and blood imply a

new "human nature Body" of Christ-God. And as the Church teaches, as we will see later, that the Body of Christ, His "human nature Body," is "incorruptible, immortal," that is, "imperishable meat," then what becomes of it if its presence ceases in the communicant when the "species" have "ceased because of digestion" or been destroyed by his "natural heat," and it is not literally "consumed" to nothingness, as natural food is when it is consumed? And why should His presence be governed and limited by digestion or "natural heat?" That very fact alone shows the erroneousness and absurdity of the doctrine of the Real Presence. But if the doctrine is true then a new "whole and entire" Christ-God or new flesh and blood of His must necessarily be made at the consecration at Mass. Such being the case, then what becomes of Him when the appearances under which He is supposed to be veiled have "ceased because of digestion" or been destroyed by "natural heat?" Some may say that that is not so important a question as to cause one to quibble over or to doubt the doctrine of the Real Presence. But it is really a more important question than first appears on the face of it. For by "digging a little deeper" the question becomes of great importance; for it can not be answered without involving many contradictions and difficulties. I did at one time think the question could be answered in two ways. But when I put them to the test they could not stand the test of an analysis with the "arms of the intellect," the weapons the Church says she will one day use in her "warfare with Infidelity."

Even to the casual observer it becomes more evident from day to day that the time of a great warfare is fast approaching, The battle will be fought and won, not with material arms, but with the arms of the intellect. Two great armies, and only

two, will be engaged in the combat—the Catholic Church and Infidelity (St. Benedict's Church Calendar, March 3, 1902, p. 5).

And surely the Church can not, in analyzing her teachings, rightly deny any one the use of the same weapons, the "arms of the intellect," with which she would attack the teachings of Infidelity, or any other system opposed to her teachings. And surely we have a right to follow up the act of receiving Christ-God in Communion and know what becomes of Him, just as we have the right to follow up, if we want to, the act of eating food and knowing what becomes of it, etc. There are two answers, and they are as follows:

1. That Christ-God then leaves one again, "whole and entire."

2. That Christ-God then is assimilated to nothingness, just as food that is properly taken into the stomach and is digested, is assimilated to nothingness; that is, it is food no longer because of its having become digested.

On analyzing those answers I found, however, that neither one of them could be admitted. For in the first case, the soul of the communicant would not have retained any part or substance of Christ-God (otherwise He would then be less than a "whole and entire" Christ-God after He left the communicant), and the soul would therefore not have received or retained anything substantial and lasting that would give it any lasting nourishment and strength; it being the same as though one should reject or vomit out again "whole and entire" a meal that one had just eaten, a process which would certainly not nourish and strengthen the body.

Again, if Christ-God leaves one again "whole and entire," or He is not consumed and assimilated to nothingness, annihilation, as natural food is when eaten, then how has one eaten and drunk the flesh and blood of

Christ-God and "consumed" them, or how is one's soul nourished by them if they are not literally consumed and assimilated and they leave one again "whole and entire" in about fifteen minutes? Would you call that eating and drinking a thing if it left again in fifteen minutes "whole and entire," unconsumed and unassimilated, as chewing gum is, which one does not eat but only chews? We do not say a person eats chewing gum or tobacco when he chews it only and does not swallow it. It would seem, then, that to really eat and drink the flesh and blood of God, they would have to be literally "consumed" and assimilated, just as natural foods are when one eats and drinks and consumes them, and as no doubt understood by the Jews. How, then, has one eaten and drunk the flesh and blood of Christ-God when they are taken into the mouth and they are not literally consumed and assimilated to nothingness? That is another difficulty, is it not? For to receive Christ-God into the mouth and not to assimilate Him, would not be eating Him literally.

Then again, if He is not consumed and assimilated to nothingness, and He leaves "whole and entire" when the Eucharist has "ceased because of digestion" or been destroyed by "natural heat," it makes it apparent that space would be filled with the disembodied egos of the new Christ-Gods that were made at the consecrations at Masses. For according to the doctrine of transubstantiation material substances have been transmuted into a new Christ-God, with a separate ego, mind, will and consciousness, at each consecration in the Mass, who begins existence at the point where the substances of bread and wine cease to be any longer bread and wine substances That also can not be admitted if there is to be but one "whole and entire" Christ-God. The first

answer, then, to the question of what becomes of Him after the "species" have "ceased because of digestion," can not be admitted, can it? Hardly.

Now, as to the second answer, that then He is assimilated to nothingness, as natural food is that is properly eaten and digested. That answer also can not be admitted, for if we did then we would have to admit that the soul of the communicant is more substantial and powerful than Christ-God, if it can assimilate His Body to nothingness, a proposition no rational mind will or can admit. And if the soul of the communicant does not assimilate him to nothingness—that is, His flesh and blood, which must be the same as a "whole and entire" living Christ-God, otherwise they would be as dead flesh and blood—then why more than one reception of Him in the Eucharist? Can not the finite be filled and remain filled by the reception of one Infinite? Think of that question again.

The Church says:

> The soul, like the body, needs frequent nourishment; and the Holy Eucharist provides that food which is best adapted to the support of its life (Letter from Pope Leo XIII on the Most Holy Eucharist, p. 30).
>
> The Church thus invites you: *Let not the faithful neglect to nourish and sustain their souls daily with this spiritual food. They do not fail each day to feed their bodies. It is clear that the soul needs spiritual food no less than the body needs material food* (Frequent and Daily Communion, Father Lintelo, S. J., p. 25).

Now, why does the body need daily or "frequent nourishment?" It is because natural food is a temporary substance and is assimilated, consumed to nothingness. Must it not be the same, then, with the Body of Christ-God in the Eucharist, the "spiritual food" of the

soul, if it must be eaten daily or often for the "frequent nourishment" of the soul? Yes. He must, then, be literally consumed and assimilated to nothingness, must He not, if He must be received daily or often for the frequent nourishment of the soul? Yes. But that can not be admitted, as we saw.

Of course, the Church teaches that He is ever eaten in Communion, but without being "consumed" (Truth, Rev. Thomas F. Price, March, 1907, p. 341); that is, without being assimilated to nothingness. That would be about like ever chewing a piece of gum but without ever consuming it. But when one has such a piece of gum filling one's mouth to the full, then does one take more gum into one's mouth? No, decidedly not. And how, then, has one eaten and drunk the flesh and blood of the Son of Man, or how is his soul fed and nourished by them, if one has not literally "consumed" and assimilated them to nothingness, as one does the natural food and drink for the body that he eats and drinks with the mouth, assimilates and digests to nothingness?

And if He is "ever eaten without being consumed," then why more than one reception of Him in the form of the Eucharist, and especially by clerics, as, for instance on Christmas, when every one says or is supposed to say three Masses, oftentimes one right after the other, in each of which they receive a supposed "whole and entire" living God? Or rather two, if the following is true; for clerics saying Mass partake of both bread and wine:

> Christ is whole and entire under the appearance of bread, whole and entire under the appearance of wine (Sacramental Life of the Church, Rev. Bernard J. Otten, S. J., p. 77).

Yes, why, then, so many receptions of Christ-God in

Communion if He is not consumed? It must be because He is, too, consumed, must it not? Yes. But by what we have seen, that can not be admitted, can it? No.

As neither of the two answers in question, then, could be admitted, I wrote to a number of clerics, from priests up to higher Church dignitaries in this country, for an answer to the question:

What becomes of Christ after the appearances of bread and wine received in Communion no longer continue to exist?

Although I had enclosed self-addressed stamped envelopes for their answers not one answered, but one of them returned my letter with the following endorsement on the back of it:

Pray, sir, which was the first, the chicken or the egg?

As no cleric, then, would answer my question I wrote to a prominent Catholic professor and historian for an answer. This is what he wrote me:

As to your blasphemous question about "What becomes of Christ," etc., any Christian knowing his catechism can answer you that, after a *worthy* Holy Communion Christ is and remains in your soul as long as you do not chase Him away by sin and enthrone Satan in His place.

That answer, however, only presented another difficulty instead of satisfactorily answering my question, which I will leave to the reader to say whether or not it is any more a "blasphemous" one than is the Church's question of:

How long does Christ remain present with His sacred Flesh and Blood?

That difficulty is this: "If Christ is and remains in your soul as long as you do not chase Him away by sin

and enthrone Satan in His place," then every cleric would on Christmas, after having said the third Mass, have to contain within himself six, or at last, three, "whole and entire" living Gods, each with a separate ego, mind, will and consciousness, sandwiched, as it were, in his stomach; for there is where the "species" really go. For surely, at the least, most of the clerics receive "worthy Holy Communions" when they communicate at each of the three Masses they celebrate in one day, sometimes one right after the other, and who hardly "chase Christ away by sin and enthrone Satan in His place" between those Masses and Communions.

Well, that seemed to be another absurdity. For if He is not consumed and remains till He is "chased away by sin," then why the need of receiving another Christ-God, or two more, or rather, six within a few hours? Is one present Christ-God not sufficient when He is omnipotent? Yes. He is then not present in the Eucharist, is He? No.

The layman's belief also does not agree with what the Church teaches. But then many non-agreements exist between what their Church really teaches and what laymen believe.

The Church would have us believe (Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. Keenan, p. 112), that when a cleric communicates under both forms of bread and wine, he receives no more than he who receives the form of bread alone. But if, as we saw, Christ is "whole and entire" in each species, with a separate ego, mind and consciousness in each species, then would not a cleric receive two separate and distinct conscious living Christs, when communicating under both forms of bread and wine and He is present "whole and entire" under each form, just like a person would be eating two oysters who took two

oysters exactly alike into his mouth? Or do two separate and distinct Christ-Gods' egos, minds and consciousnesses merge or immerse into one ego, mind and consciousness when they come into contact with each other? Do the separate egos, minds, wills and consciousnesses of a single man and woman merge into one ego, mind, will and consciousness when they get married and become "one flesh?" No. To receive, then, two separate species a cleric must receive two "whole and entire" Christs, must he not? Yes. But it may still be said that to communicate under both forms one receives no more than he who communicates only under one form, just as one who has two or more copies of the same book has only one and the same truth "whole and entire," and no more, than he who has but one copy of the book. But if one seeks and assimilates the one truth then would he at the very same time read or devour two or more books exactly alike? No. And has each copy of a book a separate conscious ego, mind and will like each "species," supposed to contain a "whole and entire" Christ-God, has? No.

In view, then, of what we have seen, clerics must then on Christmas, after having said the third Mass, contain within themselves six "whole and entire" Christ-Gods, each with a separate ego, mind, will and consciousness, unless they should "chase" a few of them "away by sin" between each of the three Masses. Is that not so? Yes. Oh, the blindness that can not see the error in the doctrine of the Real Presence!

CHAPTER II.

As I, then, could not find an answer that could stand the test of an analysis with the "arms of the intellect," noble and God-given faculties, which God intended we should make use of and not "throw under the feet of faith" (Goffine, Rev. Leonard Goffine, p. 409), and an answer that would appeal to the understanding, as St. Paul said (2 Tim. 2:7; Col. 1:9; etc.) spiritual things pertaining to salvation should, I reread the Bible, and that more closely than ever, to see if I could not find something that would show that the doctrine of the Real Presence is an error, resting on a possibly wrong interpretation of certain words. In doing so I discovered that the word "is" in "This is my body; this is my blood," as Christ used that word, meant "represents" or "signifies." And here is where I made that discovery: Christ said, as He handed to His disciples the chalice containing wine, which He had blessed:

> Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the new testament, which *shall be shed* for many unto remission of sins (Matt. xxvi. 27, 28).

Well, as the very wine the Apostles drank, and digested by the "natural heat" of their stomachs, and which was the wine of which Christ spoke when He said: "This is my blood," was certainly later not shed by Him, whose veins were already full of blood, as blood by Him on the cross, then He certainly did not mean that the very wine His disciples drank and

digested was His real living blood which he would later shed on the cross, but merely represented or "signified" it. The same interpretation of the word "is" applies to "This is my body" (Matt. 26:26). For the bread they ate was not later nailed to the cross, but they ate and digested it to nothingness. The word "is," then, as used under the circumstances in question, stands for or means represents or signifies, does it not? Yes. And that was the contention of Zwingli in his controversy with Luther over the doctrine of the Real Presence, that the word "is," as used in "This is my body; this is my blood," stood for "signifies." For Zwingli said:

> There is no other word in the Greek language than *sori* (is) to express "signifies" (History of The Reformation, D'Aubigne, p. 346).

But whether or not "there is no other word in the Greek language than 'is' to express 'signifies'" or represents, we saw that the way Christ used that word it could not mean anything other than "signifies" or represents. For the very wine that His disciples drank and digested certainly was not later shed as blood by Christ on the cross. And it was the wine they later drank and digested of which He had said: "This is my blood, . . . which shall be shed," or is shed. Note also, when He said, immediately after they drank the wine:

> And I say to you, I will not drink from henceforth of *this fruit of the vine*, until I shall drink it with you in the kingdom of my Father (Matt. 26:29).

how He completely shattered any such thought or belief as that the wine, "this fruit of the vine," of which they all drank with Him, was His real living

blood. Note also how in John 13:27 Christ called what Judas ate, the "morsel." Of course, according to Luke 22:18 it appears, and as the Church contends (Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. Keenan, p. 218), Christ said that of the chalice that they were to "divide among" themselves. But it seems they had but one chalice, so that St. Matthew may have the correct version after all. He was also present at the Last Supper, while St. Luke was not, so that it must have been the chalice of which He said: "This is my blood," of which He later spoke as "this fruit of the vine." Besides, it would be absurd to think He drank His own blood, which would have been the case had the "fruit of the vine" been His real living blood, or Himself "whole and entire."

The question of whether or not Christ had the power to change bread and wine into His body and blood does not enter into the matter at all. That is not the question under consideration. Omnipotent power is not questioned in this work. It is not a question of "how can God do so-and-so" when "I can't."

Christ used the word "is" in the same way and sense that one would use it who had in his hand a group photograph of persons and would point out the different persons represented by saying, as he put his finger on each individual's picture:

This is Mary Jones; this is Sally Rowe; this is John Smith, etc.,

although there is in the English language a word that clearly expresses represents or "signifies." In the same way Christ meant it when He said: "This is my body; this is my blood." For if otherwise, then how

absurd it must have seemed to the Apostles at the Last Supper to have been forced to believe, which they would have had to were there a Real Presence of Christ in blessed Communion bread and wine, that Christ, "whole and entire," sat in full view before them and that at the same time each had Him living and "whole and entire" within himself, under the appearances of the bread and wine of which they had just partaken; thus also making at the Last Supper thirteen "whole and entire" living Christ-Gods, or rather twenty-seven, if the following are true:

Q. Did the Apostles receive Jesus Christ Himself whole and entire; first, under the appearance of bread; and, secondly, under the appearance of wine?

A. Yes; they received Him whole and entire under each form (Catechism of the Christian Doctrine, a Jesuit Missionary, p. 69).

It is generally held that our Lord on this occasion (the Last Supper) made thirteen divisions of the Holy Eucharist, and that He Himself communicated, and permitted the traitor Judas to communicate with the rest. The Fathers of the Eastern Church, as well as those of the Western, have always held this (A History of the Mass and its Ceremonies in the Eastern and Western Church, Rev. John O'Brien, A. M., pp. 328, 329).

That, then, made twenty-seven "whole and entire" Christs, each with a separate ego, mind, will and consciousness, at the Last Supper, one under the appearance of flesh, whom the Apostles beheld with their natural eyes, and twenty-six under the appearances of bread and wine, which they beheld with the eyes of faith. Yet there is supposed to be but one God. What an anomaly! Then again, think of Christ communicating Himself with Himself, God eating God, as it were. Could anything be more erroneous and absurd than the doctrine of the Real Presence, when

if it were true, and Christ communicated Himself with Himself, God would be eating Himself? And it would also be making a multiplicity of Gods, were there a Real Presence in each Eucharist.

Here is an illustration by which the Church attempts to show that there is but one God notwithstanding there may at the very same time be one in each Eucharist, in the many churches and chapels in the world:

A Jew was amusing himself in the public square, when there passed a priest who, accompanied by a crowd, carried the most holy Viaticum to a sick person. All the people, bending the knee, rendered due homage of adoration to the Most Holy Sacrament; the Jew alone made no movement, nor gave any token of reverence. This being seen by a poor woman, she exclaimed, "O miserable man, why do you not show reverence to the true God, present in this divine sacrament?" "What true God?" said the Jew sharply. "If this were so, would not there be many Gods, since on each of your altars there is one during Mass?" The woman instantly took a sieve, and, holding it up to the sun, told the Jew to look at the rays which passed through the chinks; and then added, "Tell me, Jew, are there many suns which pass through the opening of this sieve, or only one?" And the Jew answering that there was but one sun, "Then," replied the woman, "why do you wonder that God incarnate, veiled in the sacrament, though one, indivisible and unchanged, should, through excess of love, place Himself in true and real presence on different altars?" Through this illustration, he was led on to confess the truth of the faith (The Hidden Treasure; or, The Value and Excellence of The Holy Mass, St. Leonard of Port Maurice, pp. 48, 49).

According to that illustration, Eucharists would only be the reflections or emanations of God, and not God "whole and entire," just as the many rays of the sun which passed through the "chinks" of a sieve were only the reflections or emanations of the one

sun, and were not each the sun "whole and entire," or, as the words of a speaker radiating in all directions are but emanations from him, and are not the speaker "whole and entire," as the God in the Eucharist is supposed to be a God "whole and entire." Is that not so? Yes. The illustration used, then, does not remove the fact of the multiplicity of "whole and entire" Gods in the many Eucharists "on each of the altars" in Catholic churches, who is there "for the worship and the feeding of His people" (Messenger of the Sacred Heart, June, 1909, p. 347), were there a Real Presence of God in the Eucharist, were Transubstantiation true, and were each Eucharist a God of "concrete reality," "objectively present"—Rev. B. Stewart Chambers, D. D. (Catholic Register, May 29, 1909). The dogma of the Real Presence, then, cannot be true, can it, unless we admit that there are as many "whole and entire" Gods as there are Eucharists? No. For there is but one "whole and entire" God, who is infinite, is from eternity, cannot be made or be compressed into a wafer, so that it can be said that "here is the God who created the universe," or, "here is more of God than there," just as one cannot focalize the light of the sun and say: Here is more light of the sun than there in open space, or, here is the sun but not there, or, here is gravitation but not there.

Another argument the Church uses in which to get around the difficulty of the multiplicity of Christ-Gods, were there a Real Presence in each Eucharist, is the following:

> Let us make a few remarks upon the second great miracle in connection with the Holy Eucharist, viz., the multiplication of the real presence. We must observe, at starting, that the word "multiplication" is to be applied, not to the *Person* of

Christ, but to the *Presence* of Christ. If two priests are celebrating Mass at the same moment, one in London and the other in Sydney, what happens when they come to the words of consecration? There is a Glorified Body in the London Church, but is there *another* glorified Body in the Sydney Church? No! Not *another*. It is the same sacred Body in both places. . . . Hence it is not our Lord's Body that is multiplied, but merely the presence of that one Body in ten thousand times ten thousand places. And just as Christ foreshadowed the mystery of Transubstantiation, by changing water into wine [Did that very wine "pre-exist," and did the accidents of water still remain?], so did He also foreshadow the multiplication of His sacramental presence by the multiplication of the loaves and fishes in the desert (Thoughts for All Times, Rev. Vaughan, pp. 145, 146).

It seems to be hard to distinguish the difference between the multiplication of the *Person* of Christ and the multiplication of the *Presence* of Christ, if each *Presence* of Christ is a substantial entity with a separate ego, mind, will and consciousness, such as a *Person* has. We might multiply the presence of the image or picture of an individual for an indefinite number of times, but such images would not have conscious egos, minds and wills such as the living individual has. When Adam and Eve "multiplied" (Gen. 1:28) themselves did it not result in separate egos with separate minds and wills in each multiplication of themselves? Multiplication, then, means as many separate egos, minds and wills as there are multiplications of an entity with a separate ego, mind and will, does it not? Yes. The multiplication, then, of the Presence of Christ in separate Eucharists must then make a separate Christ, with a separate ego, mind and will in each Eucharist. And would that not make a multiplicity of "whole and entire" Christs were He present

in each Eucharist on the many altars in Catholic churches? Yes.

The following illustration does not remove the difficulty of that fact, nor answer it:

Let us illustrate this in some way. The Scripture itself seems to suggest an illustration. It often speaks of our Lord as the *Word* of the Father; the Word made flesh. But let us take an ordinary word—a human word. Consider what an illustration it affords us. I utter a word, and at once that word is intimately present with each one who hears it. That word in its entirety penetrates into every ear that is open to sound. If but one person be present, he receives the word in its entirety. If five hundred or a thousand persons be present, each individual of that multitude receives the same word in its entirety. No one receives more than another; each has what the other has; no more, no less. . . . A beautiful image, surely, of the Word of God, the Eternal Word made flesh, . . . entering into the soul of every communicant. We may still further illustrate the Catholic doctrine by pointing out another name given to Jesus Christ. He is spoken of as the wisdom of the Father; or, again, as the Truth. . . . So in the Blessed Sacrament, if one hundred particles are consecrated, the incarnate wisdom of God is present under each, just as the wisdom of any author is present in each of a hundred volumes. . . . And just as the same truth is equally present, whether in small type or large type, so the same Jesus Christ is equally present, whether the accidents of the Host, *i. e.,* the shape, color and size, be the same or different. This is, of course, only an analogy; a mere illustration, and not to be pressed too far; for, whereas in a book the truth is merely expressed by signs; in the Blessed Sacrament the Eternal Truth, *i. e.,* the infinite God, is substantially present in His human and Divine nature (Thoughts for All Times, Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan, pp. 150-153).

Would that not still make a multiplicity of Gods were He "substantially present in His human and Divine nature" in each Eucharist or part of Eucharist, made a "concrete reality" in each? Five hundred or

a thousand persons may hear, as well as though there were but one person present, the selfsame words uttered by a speaker, but the words are not the speaker himself "whole and entire" by any means, they are at the most only his spirit, thoughts and sentiments. Nor are the contents of a book the author himself "whole and entire," and when the book is torn the truth in it is broken, disconnected. Nor is a book a conscious entity as each Eucharistic Christ is supposed to be, that is, to the eyes of faith He is. And if He were not, then what would be the difference between a God of "concrete reality" in the Eucharist and a pagan god of "concrete reality" in wood or stone?

To focus and localize God "in His human and Divine nature" would also be to circumscribe Him. But as He is an Infinite Being He cannot be focused into anything and be localized so that it could be said: Here is God, but not there; or, Here is more of His Spirit than there; for no one knows "whence He cometh, and whither He goeth" (John 3:8). He is as universal as gravitation, and no one can focus and localize it and say: Here is gravitation, but not there; or, here is more gravitation than is there. It is the same with the omnipresence of God, His Spirit, it is universal and cannot be focused and localized into anything of a "concrete reality," be it in the Eucharist or not.

In view, then, of what we have seen, the illustrations used by the Church, and the claim of the multiplication of the Presence, but not the Person, of Christ-God, do not remove the difficulty of the multiplicity of Christ-Gods, with separate egos, minds and wills, were Transubstantiation true and the "human

and Divine nature" of Christ-God was localized in every Eucharist, was made a "concrete reality."

Again; when a book, the "accidents" in which the truth is inherent, is destroyed, so that its specific form, its "concrete reality," is no longer in existence, then what becomes of the truth, "substance"? Is it not destroyed so far as that particular book is concerned? Yes. In like manner, then, if the Word and Wisdom of the Father form a separate conscious entity in every Eucharist, then what becomes of that entity after the Eucharist in which it was inherent has "ceased because of digestion," been destroyed by "natural heat"? Is it merged with another separate conscious entity of Christ-God inherent in another Eucharist, or with the "Lord's sacred Body in Heaven"? If so, then would that not add to the quantity or size of it?

The multiplication, then, of the Presence of Christ-God in many localized Eucharists, without multiplying the ego, mind and will of Christ-God, is certainly nothing but theological "verbiage," which it seems some admire.

> Nothing can impose better on a people than verbiage; the less they understand the more they admire. Our fathers and doctors have often said, not what they thought, but what circumstances and necessity forced them to—St. Gregory to St. Jerome (Isis Unveiled, P. P. Blavatsky, Vol. 2, p. 183).

Again, would you imbibe and assimilate truth or the wisdom in a book by eating the book with your mouth, because it says:

> They that eat me (wisdom), shall yet hunger; and they that drink me, shall yet thirst (Eccles. 24:29)?

No. Is it not an error, then, to believe that one can imbibe, assimilate and put on the "wisdom of the

Father," the Word, Truth, Christ, His "spirit and life," by eating Him literally with one's mouth, that is, by receiving Catholic Communion?

The Church, as it were, has eaten with the mouth the Person of Christ instead of with the mind and will, a mental operation, imbibing and assimilating His "spirit and life," just as one would eat a book in order to acquire the truth or wisdom inherent in it, instead of reading it and imbibing and assimilating its contents with the mind and understanding.

Besides, truth, words and wisdom in many books are not living conscious entities as Christ-God is supposed to be in each Eucharist. And if he is not consciously present in each Eucharist, then why do Catholics prostrate themselves before it and pray to it? They do not look beyond the Eucharist for God as one does of a picture of a person for that person. Christ, then, is not present in the Eucharist, unless we admit a multiplicity of Christ-Gods, is He? No.

Again, were there a Real Presence then no doubt the Apostles would have been puzzled to know which Christ they should have adored and worshiped, the one each supposedly had within himself or the one who sat in full view before them and conversed with them. For the Church teaches that right after the reception of Communion Christ is nearer to and closer united to the communicant than He possibly could be under any other circumstances, and that we should then—

Listen for a moment to Jesus Christ; perhaps He has something to say to you. There may be some promise you have made and broken, which He wishes you to make again and keep. Answer Jesus in your heart, and tell Him all your troubles (The Mass Book, Rev. A. P. Doyle, p. 42).

It seems, though, that the Apostles, after they had communicated, did not listen to or tell their troubles to the supposed "Jesus in their hearts," but conversed with and followed "unto Mount Olivet" (Matt. 26: 29) the living Jesus whom they beheld with their natural eyes. They just acted, as Protestants do, as though the bread and wine which they had just partaken were only as so much blessed bread and wine, which Christ used with which to institute a memorial of His death, "until He come."

The puzzle in question ought no doubt also be one to the present-day thinking clerics and laymen, who have just communicated, as to which Christ-God they should have in mind and thought when they adore and worship a living Christ-God, the one each has just supposedly received in Communion, and who is supposed to be within one "whole and entire," "dwells in the hearts of His creatures corporally" (Aspirations of Nature, Very Rev. I. T. Hecker, p. 326), or the one who is supposed at the very same time to be a "concrete reality" upon the altar in the Eucharist. And did you ever think of that when you communicated and believed you had a "whole and entire" living Christ-God "corporally" within yourself, while at the very same time there was supposed to be one in "concrete reality" upon the altar to whom you genuflected when you left the Communion railing or the church? Now candidly, if you are a Catholic, did you ever think of that when you communicated? I venture to say you did not. Oh, the blindness and thoughtlessness of man at times with regard to some of the Catholic teachings and practices! But, then, I was that way once myself, and it was only through a severe affliction, that made the occasion for me to do much

reading for pastime, that my eyes were opened and I began to think of what I was doing when I received Catholic Communion.

Then again, were the doctrine of the Real Presence true, it would seem to be a shocking thought to think that Christ-God was in one's stomach immediately after having received Him in Communion, if He can be localized in a Host. For that is where He would be if He is inherent in and inseparable from the Host so long as the "natural heat" has not yet destroyed the Host, which faith tells us is the living God, as may be seen by the following:

> No voice comes from the Tabernacle to stir the hearts of men. The Sacred Host gives no outward token of the Living Presence within. . . . All that our eyes perceive is a round, white piece of bread, which faith tells us is the living God (Tabernacle and Purgatory, August, 1905, p. 37).

There is hardly any doubt about it that the "living God" goes into the stomach of the communicant. For when I used to receive Communion lying in bed, during the time that I was bedfast, the priest who brought the "living God" to me in a handbag (which shows that when a priest carries a handbag one cannot tell whether it contains some clean linen or the "living God," his Creator, the creature carrying in his handbag his Creator "whole and entire"), and administered Communion to me, immediately after giving me the Host would give me a tablespoonful of water with which to wash it down. The church also teaches the following:

> Communion should not be received if there is any danger of vomiting shortly after (How to Become a Catholic, Rev. George M. Searle, p. 81).

But why should vomiting have anything to do with the Real Presence or have any effect on it, unless Christ-God really is inherent in the Host when it reaches and is in the stomach? And is the Eucharist then a sort of a magnet that draws and holds God, and the moment it is ejected by vomiting it draws Him with itself from the vomiting communicant; or when it has "ceased because of digestion" He can then make His get-away?

The Church teaches further the following:

> Spitting should be avoided for about half an hour after receiving, for fear that some particle of the Blessed Sacrament [God] might be rejected in this way. . . . It will usually be acted on more quickly by the stomach than by the mouth (How to Become a Catholic, Rev. Searle, pp. 81, 84).
>
> Do not keep the Sacred Host [God] in your mouth until it is quite dissolved; but let it moisten a little upon your tongue, and then swallow it (Deharbe's Catechism No. 1, p. 273).

Now, where does God go but into the stomach when the Host received in Communion is washed down with a tablespoonful of water or is moistened upon the tongue, is swallowed, is acted upon by the stomach and one must avoid "spitting for about half an hour after receiving," if the "living God" is inherent in and inseparable from the Eucharist as long as the "natural heat" of the stomach has not destroyed its appearances? He must, then, go into the stomach, must He not? Yes. Or if He should not be in the stomach of the communicant, but in his heart, then while God is in the heart does He keep an eye on the Host in the stomach of the communicant and the moment He sees that it has "ceased because of digestion," or He sees the sick communicant vomiting "shortly after," or sees him spitting within "half an

hour after receiving," He makes His presence in the heart to cease also by taking leave of it? How absurd that would be if He did that. Yet that is the way God would have to act did He not go into one's stomach at the reception of the Host, which goes into the stomach. The "living God," then, must go into the stomach of the communicant, must He not? Yes. Then think of God, your Creator, "whole and entire," stalking about or swimming around in your stomach, or being buried under an avalanche of food. For no doubt some communicants, as on holy days or during missions, when they must soon after receiving Communion eat a hurried breakfast so as to get to their places of occupation on time, or the bedfast sick, begin to eat before the "natural heat"—unless it is pretty strong—has caused the Host to be destroyed. Shocking! shocking! shocking is such a thought, is it not! Yes. Yet such would be the case were there a Real Presence of the "living God" in the Host as long as it had not "ceased because of digestion." Is that not so? Yes. The "living God," then, is not in the Eucharist, is He? No.

Again, if spitting and vomiting too soon after receiving Communion causes the presence of Christ-God to cease, to leave, then that does not agree with the statement of the Catholic professor who said that "Christ is and remains in your soul as long as you do not chase Him away by sin and enthrone Satan in His place," does it? No. Which of the two, then, is right? If the Church is right, then the "living God" must go into the stomach of the communicant; for if He did not, and He is in the heart of the communicant, then what difference should it make whether or

not the communicant vomited "shortly after" or should spit? Think of that question again.

Writing in the third person to an authoritative publication of the Church, in order to be sure that my questions would be answered, about the doctrine of the Real Presence and that it would appear to be a shocking thought to think that "then in Communion God would go into one's stomach," it had the following to say:

> Our correspondent has made a poor choice of the "absurdities" which flow from the literal eating of the flesh of Christ, when he chose the fact that the consecrated wafer "goes into the stomach." It may "shock" him, but that is because his nervous system is in a morbid condition, but it does not shock healthy mortals, nor is it any more absurd than the *fact which flows from the very nature of God,* that God by His essence, power, knowledge, providence, is *everywhere, wholly and entirely present* (Truth, February, 1908, p. 263).

If the foregoing is true, then can a priest focus or compress into a wafer more of the "essence," substance of God than is "everywhere, wholly and entirely present," and say to the people:

> Here in the consecrated wafer is more of the "essence," substance of God than is everywhere where there is no consecrated wafer?

No, he cannot, if what St. Paul said is true, that "they are not Gods which are made by hands" (Acts 19:26), and that God "dwelleth not in houses or temples made by hand" (Acts 7:48 and 17:24), he cannot focus or compress God into any certain spot or place and make Him a "concrete reality," "objectively present," no more so than he can focus gravitation into any certain place. Yet one Sunday a priest in his sermon,

when speaking about God and pagan gods said, as he turned towards the altar and pointed to it:

> We have not a deaf and dumb God as is the man-made god of wood or stone of the pagans, who cannot hear or answer prayers, but we have a living God, who lives and is *there present* in the Tabernacle upon the altar.

Make your own comments.

Then again, if God were present in the Eucharist, the question arises, who or what mutilates or mangles Him and deprives or drives out from His supposed flesh and blood the living Soul that permeated them or His body, so that His body can be fed upon, be digested and its assimilated substance flow in the veins of the communicant as "the blood of a God?" For the Church teaches the following:

> My soul, thou art (in Communion) about to feed upon the blessed body of Jesus. And hast thou well considered what thou art, and who God is? (The Hidden Treasure, St. Leonard of Port Maurice, p. 217).
>
> You can say with truth, especially after having received Holy Communion, that the blood of a God flows in your veins (The Prodigal Son; or, The Sinner's Return to God, Rev. Michael Müller, p. 88).
>
> St. Ephrem, of Edessa, says: "His body, by a new method, is mixed with our bodies (in Communion), and His most pure blood is transfused into our veins. He is wholly incorporated with us" (The Real Presence, Rev. C. F. Smarius, S. J., p. 19).

If, then, in Communion we "feed upon the blessed body of Jesus," God, "His body is mixed with our bodies, and his most pure blood is transfused into our veins," so that then "the blood of a God flows in our veins," then something or some one must mutilate and mangle Him and drive His Soul or life out

of His body so that it can be fed upon, be digested and its substance flow in the veins of communicants as "the blood of a God;" just as something must mutilate and mangle, for instance, a live "whole and entire" grasshopper that has thus been swallowed by a turkey, and deprive it of its life or drive it out, so that its dead body can be digested and its substance flow in the veins of the turkey as the blood of a grasshopper. Is that not so? Yes. Well, that is another thought too shocking to admit. In view of that, then, the "living God" is not in the Eucharist, is He? Hardly.

Again, if the Soul of God is driven out of His body when it is consumed, digested and its substance flows in our veins as "the blood of a God," then what becomes of that particular Soul, mind and will that inhabited the body?

Again, how is the glorified body of Christ-God in Heaven "mixed with our bodies, incorporated with us," if it is not mutilated and mangled, digested and assimilated? Or does one after all not eat and drink the literal flesh and blood of Christ, such as the Jews apparently believed they were to eat and drink? And if so, then were they not misled by the repetition of the declarations of Christ, that one must eat the flesh of the Son of Man, etc.? He must then be mutilated and mangled, must He not, if He is really eaten and drunk in Communion, and there is a Real Presence in the Host? Yes. But such a proposition cannot be admitted. There is, then, no Real Presence in the Host, is there? No.

In writing Truth about the Real Presence and that "then something would have to mangle the 'living God' and drive from His flesh and blood His living Soul," it said:

We are positively pained to find that our correspondent whose former letters give us to understand that he is an assiduous reader of Truth misrepresents Catholic doctrine on a point on which a question was answered in July Truth, page 66. "Death, such as the death which awaits each one of us, that is, the separation of soul and body, is that death, which as St. Paul says, He 'dies no more'." This is the only answer we feel obliged to give to his objection that "Then something would have to mangle the 'living God' and drive from His flesh and blood His living soul" (Truth, February, 1908, p. 263).

The question in its July number referred to is the following, which was asked by another correspondent:

When the Host, or consecrated wafer, which is Christ, is eaten, and, as Christ dies on being eaten, are not the material elements left in His corpse? Now suppose the digestive organs of the partaker are in such an abnormal condition that this sacred species are not digested, is there then a miracle performed changing it back into bread again, or does it remain His corpse?

Answer: The death of Christ, on the consumption of the Sacred Host is not death in the ordinary sense of the word, but a mystical death. Death, such as the death which awaits each one of us, that is, the separation of soul and body, is that death, which, as St. Paul says, He "dies no more?" In the sacrifice of the Mass and the Blessed Eucharist Christ sheds His blood for us in a mystical manner, by the separate consecration of the bread and wine, and He dies in a mystical manner also by the withdrawal of the Presence from the elements of bread and wine. This withdrawal occurs when such a physical change takes place in the bread and wine as that they no longer have such appearances or accidents as would entitle them still to be called bread and wine. There is never left in them "a dead body of Christ". When this occurs the substance of the body and blood of Christ, which before supported the appearances, or accidents of bread and wine, is withdrawn, and those accidents are again supported by the substance proper to them, in a word, the elements again become what they appear to be. As may be seen from what has

been said, it is not necessary for the bread and wine to be asssimilated as food in order that the Real Presence be withdrawn (Truth, July, 1907, p. 66).

(A Catholic professor believes, as we saw, that the Presence of Christ remains "as long as you do not chase Him away by sin." He and Truth ought to get together and smooth that over in some way.)

How is that a "mystical" death if Christ simply makes only a departure and goes to—where? when He withdraws His Presence from the Eucharist that is not consumed, or "dies on the consumption of the Host?" Would you call it a death of any kind when a person simply goes from one place to another, or withdraws from a certain place? The Church says further:

Christ is mystically immolated (on the altar), and afterwards eaten by the faithful, as in the Jewish and heathenish sacrifices the victim was first offered on the altar, and then eaten by the people (Truth, August, 1905, p. 117).

What is a "mystical death" or immolation if it is not a real death that separates the soul from the body? And what is it to shed blood "in a mystical manner?" Is not the apparent shedding of blood and death of an actor in a tragedy on the stage a shedding of blood "in a mystical manner" and a "mystical death," which are in reality only unrealities, shams? And if so, then would not likewise a shedding of blood "in a mystical manner" and a "mystical death" of Christ in Mass be but unrealities, shams? And if so, then how is the Mass a true and genuine sacrifice when a true and genuine sacrifice requires that a living victim be literally put to death "and is then consumed," "as in the Jewish and heathenish sacrifices," and a sacrifice—

Is the oblation of a victim to God to represent by its destruction or change His supreme dominion over life and death (Reasonableness of Catholic Ceremonies and Practices, Rev. J. J. Burke, p. 22)?

How is Christ destroyed or changed, in order to show God's "supreme dominion over life and death," if Christ "dies no more?" Would not a "mystical death" of Christ in Mass only make it a sham, a pretense, if He "dies no more?" And is the eating of the victim "by the faithful" also only a "mystical" eating, a pretense of eating Christ, but not really eating Him after all, just like His "mystical death" in Mass is no death after all, but only a pretense of a death, a sham? The Mass has not even the semblance of the commemoration of the Lord's death, "until He come," for which the Lord's Supper was instituted, if we take the Bible narrative of it. The Protestant Communion service, or observance of the Lord's Supper, on the other hand, has a very striking semblance to it, that becomes apparent at once when one witnesses it, and has a Bible knowledge of the Lord's Supper and the object for which it was instituted, which was "to show the death of the Lord, until He come" (I Cor. 11:26).

Again, if Christ "dies in a mystical manner also by the withdrawal of the Presence from the elements of bread and wine," "when such a physical change takes place in the bread and wine as that they no longer have" the appearances of bread and wine, then how has one eaten the flesh of the Son of Man, and drunk His blood, "consumed" Him so that the "blood of a God" flows in his veins? Would you call that eating and consuming a meal if it was shortly after being eaten vomited out again "whole and entire,"

so that its substance could not be digested and assimilated into flesh and blood? And is the precept of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Christ impossible to be complied with if one's "digestive organs" are in an "abnormal condition?" And if so, and such a one cannot literally "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," then how will he have "everlasting life," if John 6:54, 55 is to be taken in the literal sense, as the Church does? Would that not make salvation dependent a great deal on the condition of one's "digestive organs?" Yes. But we will see later that John 6:53-57 is not to be taken in the literal sense, and what it really means to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," if it does not mean a literal eating with the mouth of something that is supposed to be Christ-God, and that, therefore, it has nothing to do with "digestive organs."

Again, how has one eaten the flesh and drunk the blood of Christ if He is not present in the Eucharist with His Person, but only with His Presence, as we saw? It seems to be a case of "now you do, and you do not," eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ. Surely a "mystery!"

Again, what causes Christ to withdraw Himself from the Eucharist and by doing so die "in a mystical manner," when the Eucharist is not "assimilated as food" by one whose "digestive organs are in an abnormal condition?" Is it fermentation, chemicalization or retransubstantiation? And where was He during the time the appearances of bread and wine had not yet undergone a "physical change?" Was He in the communicant's heart? If so, then does He keep an eye on the bread and wine in the stomach of the communicant, and the moment He sees they fail to

digest and assimilate as food make His withdrawal? Would that not be absurd if He did that? And is His presence governed and regulated by the action of the "digestive organs"? Or was He during the time the bread and wine had not yet undergone in the stomach a "physical change" in the stomach with them? And if so, would that not be shocking? And how does He make His exit when He makes His withdrawal, being that it apparently requires a magnet, the Host, to get Him into one's interior? Does He come back through the throat and mouth, the way He went in? Or how does He make His exit, if He is not "consumed" and He withdraws His presence?

Again, if a communicant's "digestive organs are in such an abnormal condition that the sacred species are not digested," so that then "the Real Presence is withdrawn" and "the elements again become what they appear to be," that is, bread and wine, then would not a miracle of re-transubstantiation have to take place? For, as we saw, transubstantiation effects an entire change "of the bread and wine's substance into the substance of Christ," "annihilates" them, "so that no bread and wine whatsoever" remain; just as no substance of an egg whatsoever remains that has been changed into a living chicken. How, then, can He withdraw Himself from elements of bread and wine when no such elements remain after the consecration, they having been entirely changed into Christ? How could a chicken be withdrawn from the elements of an egg when no such elements remain, they having been entirely changed into a living chicken? Would that not be impossible without a re-transubstantiation, a changing back of a substance into that which it was originally? Yes. If, then, the "substance of Christ," His

body, blood, soul and divinity—the whole living Christ —in the appearances of bread and wine that are not digested by one in "an abnormal condition" are changed back again into the substances of natural bread and wine, such as they were before they were transubstantiated, would not a miracle of retransubstantiation have to take place, just as a miracle of retransubstantiation or re-changing would have to take place if a living chicken should be changed back again into the former inanimate substances of the egg that produced it? Yes. Who or what, then, performs that miracle, Christ, fermentation or the communicant's "abnormal condition?" And when this retransubstantiation takes place, then does the ego, mind and will of Christ that inhabited the body under the appearances of bread and wine vanish to nothingness like the ego of a chicken would whose flesh and blood should be changed back into an egg again?

The Church teaches that one of the essential "practices in the life of a Catholic" is to receive "sacramental Communion, in which not bread and wine but the real Body and Blood of Christ are received" (A Truth-Seeker and His Answers, Rev. A. P. Doyle, p. 25). If, then, no bread and wine are received then how can Christ withdraw Himself from their elements when no such elements were received by and are present in the communicant whose digestive organs are in "an abnormal condition?" Probably that is "digging a litle deeper" than the Church likes or would have a "truth-seeker" go. But by doing this "digging a little deeper" may it not easily be seen that the Church flatly contradicts herself or falls into unanswerable difficulties? For surely if in Communion is received "not bread and wine but the real Body and

Blood of Christ," then it is certainly a contradiction and a difficulty for Christ to withdraw Himself from elements that were not received and no longer exist, have been "annihilated," as we saw. The only way, then, that elements of bread and wine could be left behind in a communicant whose digestive organs were in an "abnormal condition" would be for Christ to re-transubstantiate Himself back again into elements of bread and wine out of which He was made by "the word of a priest," which is supposed to be more "than creating the world" out of nothing.

It also makes the Presence of Christ dependent on the condition of the digestive organs of the communicant, and not on his disposition and life and conduct.

Transubstantiation falls all to pieces when one "digs a little deeper" than the Church goes, does it not? Yes. That, then, proves that it is an error and that, therefore, there is no Real Presence of Christ in Communion bread and wine.

CHAPTER III.

In the preceding chapter we saw that for a priest to make a God "out of a piece of bread" is "more than creating the world"—out of nothing. If a priest has—which means that all priests have—such great power so that he can actually do that, then why do not all priests, if they are the "only authorized ministers of Christ," and the Catholic Church is the true and only Church of Christ, as she claims, heal the sick by speaking over them Christ's words, "Arise, and walk," so that we might have concrete proof of their power of performing abstract things, invisible miracles, that is, make "a God out of a piece of bread," being that Christ commanded His disciples, or—

Sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick (Luke 9:2)?

Besides, the Church says:

It is not more difficult for the Son of God to render His body present in the Eucharist, by saying *"this is my body"*, than to cure a sick woman, by saying *"woman, thou art delivered from thy infirmity"* (Luke xiii. 12); or to preserve the life of a young man, by saying to his father *"thy son liveth"* (John iv. 50); or, in short, to pardon the man, sick of the palsy, by saying to him "thy sins are forgiven thee" (An Exposition of the Doctrines of The Catholic Church, Right Rev. James B. Bossuet, pp. 62, 63).

What Christ effected personally whilst dwelling on earth, the same He effects through His ministers now that He sits at the right hand of His Father in heaven (The Sacramental Life of The Church, Rev. B. J. Otten, S. J., p. 17).

We see our Lord acting through the ministrations of His priests, and thus we say: "The Priest is another Christ"— Rt.

Rev. Charles H. Colton (Messenger of the Sacred Heart, February, 1909, p. 67).

By the mysterious and divine words uttered by the priest, or rather by Jesus Christ, who speaks by His minister, the same miracle of love which was operated at the Last Supper, on Holy Thursday, is daily renewed on our altars (Short Answers to Common Objections Against Religion, Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL. D., p. 184).

If all the foregoing are true, then why do priests not perform the "miracle of love" of healing the sick and painfully afflicted? Would not to heal them be a "miracle of love"? The Church says the following when it comes to consecration:

I (a priest) ascend the altar to say Mass, and taking a piece of bread I hold it before me, and pronounce the solemn words of consecration, and by the infinite power of God the "mystery of faith" is wrought. The substance of bread is no longer there. In its place is the substance of the body of Christ (Thoughts For All Times, Rev. Vaughan, p. 142).

(Yet if the communicant's "digestive organs are in an abnormal condition," the "mystery of faith" is unwrought by the "substance of the Body of Christ" becoming "the substance of bread," which "is no longer there." Surely there must be performed a miracle of retransubstantiation. But by whom or what?)

If a priest can work the "mystery of faith," then he should also do this:

I go to the bedside of a sick person, and taking the hand of the sick one before me, and pronounce the solemn words of healing, "Arise and walk", or, "Be thou delivered of thy infirmity", and by the infinite power of God health is wrought in the sick person. The sickness is no longer there. In its place there is now health.

Now, why do priests not do the latter if they can

do the former, if they have such great power as the Church would have us believe they have? Besides, the Church teaches the following:

Does not the efficacy of the Sacraments also depend on the worthiness or unworthiness of those who administer them?

No, for the Sacraments have their efficacy, not from him who administers them, but from the merits of Jesus Christ, by whom they were instituted (Deharbe's Catechism No. 1, p. 246).

The Sacrifice itself does not cease to be agreeable to God, although the priest who celebrates (Mass) may be wicked and sacrilegious, seeing that the principal offerer is Christ our Lord, and the priest is His mere minister (The Hidden Treasure, St. Leonard of Port Maurice, p. 41).

If such is really the case, then, that priests, who are "unworthy," or, "wicked and sacrilegious," can celebrate Masses that do not "cease to be agreeable to God," in which their pronouncing over bread wafers Christ's words "This is My body," changes them into the body and blood of Christ, and which Hosts are administered to communicants without affecting the "efficacy of the Sacrament" of the Eucharist, then all priests, whether saintly or "wicked and sacrilegious," ought to be able to make the sick of all kind get up and walk or make them well, by pronouncing over them Christ's words "Arise, and walk," or, "Be thou delivered of thy infirmity," should they not? Yes. Why, then, do they not perform the "miracle of love" of healing the sick? Did they do that it might save Catholics to the Church, keep them from apostatizing. I know of a one time good Catholic who left the Church after the death of his wife. While she was sick he prayed the Rosary, attended Mass at every opportunity he had, and had a number of Masses said for her recovery, so strong was his faith in their

efficacy. After she died he lost faith in the Mass and Rosary, no doubt judging them by their fruits, and finally lost faith in the teachings of the Church, which are peculiar to herself. In due time he married again, married a Protestant and was married by a Protestant minister, which is certainly an awful thing to do in the estimation of the Church. Now, if a priest had healed his wife, by pronouncing over her Christ's words "woman, thou art delivered of thy infirmity," would that not have been as great a "miracle of love" as to say over a piece of bread, "this is my body," which would then have placed an inanimate Eucharistic God on the altar, from whom "no voice ever comes," as we saw? Yes. Why, then, do priests not heal the sick? For it seems it would be just as easy for them to say over the sick, "Arise, and walk," or, "Be thou made whole," or, "Thou art delivered of thy infirmity," as it is to say over a piece of bread, "This is my body," which is then supposed to make "a God," which "is more than creating the world" out of nothing. And it certainly is "more than creating the world" out of nothing, to make the Infinite, Eternal and Uncreated God. Even God Himself could not make another God like Himself (Tactics of Infidels, Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL. D., p. 39). Now, if priests can do that which "is more than creating the world" out of nothing, then why do they not heal the sick? It may be said, that if they healed the sick we would never die, as though we could not die of maturity as do the fruits of the field, or that it would be a manifestation of "miraculous power." But if the Eucharist "is a miracle surpassing all other miracles" (What The Church Teaches, Rev. Edwin Drury, p. 248), and priests can work

the greater miracle, then should they not also be able to work the lesser one of healing the sick? Yes.

Had a priest healed me years ago, so that the occasion for reading much for pastime would not have come to me, I would without question be to-day as good a Catholic as I was prior to the time that I became afflicted and began to read for pastime. Why, then, do priests not heal the sick, if they are the instruments through which Christ operates and they were given "all power" (Matt. 28:18), as the Church claims was given to priests when it comes to forgiving sins in the confessional, or consecrating bread and wine into the "living God," and save Catholics to the Church, keep them from leaving her fold? It is no doubt because they have no more power to heal the sick than they have of making "out of a piece of bread" the uncreated, infinite, unchangeable and eternal God, who can not by man be focused into anything concrete, such as bread and wine, and be localized, be made a "concrete reality," so that it can be said that "here is God, but not there," or, "here is more of the essence of God than there," or, "here God is objectively present." Now back to where we digressed.

Again, were there a Real Presence in the Eucharist, then would it not be cannibalism to communicate, if the following are true?

The "Lord's Supper" is to Catholics . . . that "body which is given for you"—that "blood shed for you", bone of your bone, flesh of your flesh, blood of your blood (The Gospel Plea for Christian Unity, Rev. Martin O'Donoghue, p. 69).

The flesh of our Lord, which was formed from the most pure blood of His Holy Mother in His Incarnation, is the same flesh that we receive in Holy Communion (Magazine, Perpetual Adoration, 1905, p. 2).

The Host is the same body, in which, for the sins of men,

Jesus suffered cold and nakedness, . . . and finally death on the cross (A Pious Preparation for First Holy Communion, Rev. F. X. Lasance, p. 43).

In view of the foregoing, then, would it not be a species of rank cannibalism to communicate were Christ really present in the Eucharist?

But, says Truth:

With regard to the cannibalism implied in the expression of Catholic writers, such as "the blood of a God flows in your veins", they are no more truly so than is St. Paul's expression, *"I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me"*, a pantheistic expression, and they are used in a similar manner. . . . For us to be guilty of cannibalism we must eat the flesh "formed from the most pure blood of His Holy Mother", in its natural state. We need not deny that the Church teaches such a hideous doctrine. Christ is really, truly, wholly, substantially, bodily, present and is so eaten in Holy Communion, but He is not carnally present, with the accidents of weight, extension, form, color, odor, taste. No Catholic writer entertains such a horrible idea of that Holy of Holies. Our correspondent asks if the Catholic doctrine is not an absurdity and manifest error? If it were as he misrepresents it, it would be a manifest blasphemy (Truth, February, 1908, pp. 263, 264).

One of the Church Fathers said:

If there remain the taste and color of bread and wine be thou persuaded that it is something else. While the taste and color remain, believe thou that what thou receivest is true flesh and blood (Quoted in Truth, July, 1907, p. 77).

If it is not carnal flesh and blood, at least to the eyes of faith, that are received in Communion, then were the Jews not misled by the repetition of Christ's declaration of eating and drinking His flesh and blood (John 6:54-57), if the precept is to be taken as a mouth-eating and drinking act, as the Church has interpreted it?

I will here give a more lengthy quotation about "the blood of a God flows in your veins," so that it may be seen that it is not a figurative or "pantheistic expression" made use of by a Catholic writer:

> You can say with truth, especially after having received Holy Communion, that the blood of a God flows in your veins. What an unspeakable honor! Men boast of their ancestry. They are proud of royal blood and the blood of heroes. How great, then, is the honor of a Christian in whose veins flows the blood of the King of kings—the blood of God (The Prodigal Son, Rev. Michael Müller, p. 88).

Now, is it a "pantheistic expression" for a person of royal descent to say he has royal blood in him? Is it a "pantheistic expression" for a person of German and Irish descent to say he has German and Irish blood in him? Is it a figurative or pantheistic expression to say that a cannibal, who has eaten the flesh of a missionary, and assimilated it, has the blood of a missionary flowing in his veins? No. If, then, one eats and drinks the flesh and blood of God, so that then—"especially after having received Holy Communion," and why "especially after having received Holy Communion," if it is not to be understood literally?—"the blood of a God flows in one's veins," is that a "pantheistic expression" to say one has the "blood of God" in one's veins? No, but it is as literally true as in the instances cited above. And if so, then is it not after the manner of cannibalism to communicate were there a Real Presence of Christ-God, in His "human and Divine nature," in the Eucharist, and one should believe what he receives "is true flesh and blood" even though "there remain the taste and color of bread and wine" to the natural senses? To say it is not after the manner of canni-

balism because Christ "is not carnally present," at least to the eyes of faith, but probably "mystically," then we would have just as much grounds for saying that Christ's "bone of your bone, flesh of your flesh, blood of your blood," and His "flesh formed from the most pure blood of His Holy Mother," were not carnal bone, flesh and blood, but only "mystical" bone, flesh and blood; that the body with which He suffered on the cross was not a carnal body but only a "mystical" one. That would not be far from saying that Christ did not come to earth and suffer a carnal crucifixion, but that He came only "mystically" and suffered only a "mystical" crucifixion. For it says in plain language that the Host "is the same flesh" of Christ as that was "which was formed from the most pure blood of His Holy Mother in His Incarnation," the same Christ who was put to death on the cross, was carnally present on earth about two thousand years ago. Christ, then, must be "carnally present" to the eyes of faith, even if not to the natural eyes, must He not, if there is a Real Presence in the Eucharist and—

> The same body that was cradled in the manger at Bethlehem, the same blood that trickled down from the cross on Calvary, is there pulsating with life and energy (The Sacramental Life of the Church, Rev. B. J. Otten, S. J., p. 77)?

And if so, then would that not still make it a species of cannibalism to receive Catholic Communion? Yes. But as that would be an absurdity, then is not the doctrine of the Real Presence an absurdity and a manifest error? And have I in any way misrepresented it, when all my quotations were taken from Catholic writings?

St. Paul's saying—

> And I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me (Gal. 2:20),

means that the Spirit and teachings of Christ were ever present to his consciousness, reigned in him and governed his life, thought and conduct. But that is not a "pantheistic expression," but one of literal meaning. And it was not inspired through his having received Communion, but by having received the Spirit of Christ by faith, accepted His teachings, and letting them influence and govern his life and conduct. It was in that way also that he abided in Christ, "and Christ in him" (John 6:57).

Again, if Christ is not, at least to the eyes of faith, "carnally present," then what kind of conception is one to have of His person when supposedly receiving Him in Communion? Is it to be a "mystical" one? And if so, then is He no more real in the Eucharist than is the "mystical" death He dies in Mass a real death? Or how does He, or should He, appear to the eyes of faith when He is received in Communion, if He is not "carnally present" to the eyes of faith as He was when on earth? In fact, the Church says:

> Above all, excite your faith, remembering that it is the living Christ, God-man, who is coming to you. Represent to yourself your loving Saviour in the crib at Bethlehem, or when He passed through Judea curing the sick; look at Him on the Cross, His arms extended towards you (Frequent and Daily Communion, Father J. Lintelo, S. J., p. 48).

When I was yet a Catholic and went to Communion I imagined I was receiving "precisely the same Christ born for us of Mary, the Virgin" (Spiritual Pepper and Salt, Right Rev. Wm. Stang, D. D., p. 92), who was once on earth, and was as "present

in the Blessed Eucharist as He was present of old in the Supper Room on the eve of His death" (The Sacramental Life of The Church, Rev. B. J. Otten, p. 101), and as still pictured in prayer books, holy pictures, etc., and as described in the following:

St. John Chrysostom, who died in the beginning of the fifth century, preaching on the Eucharist, says: "If thou wert incorporeal, He would have delivered to thee those same incorporeal gifts without covering. But since the soul is united to the body, He delivers to thee in things perceptible to the senses, the things to be apprehended by the understanding. How many nowadays say: 'Would that we could look upon Him (Jesus') form, His figure, His raiment, His shoes.' Lo! thou seest Him, touchest Him, eatest Him" (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 340).

According to that, Communicants should represent to themselves when receiving Communion as receiving Christ as He was "in the crib at Bethlehem," as He was "when He passed through Judea," with "form, figure, raiment, shoes"—at least He should be so "perceptible to the senses" could one see Him with one's natural eyes. Or would the Church have us behold with the eyes of faith as receiving Christ as nude as He was when born? Or are His clothes now also spiritualized? And how does He, an infinite Being, go down the throat of the communicant, a finite being? Does He go down head first or feet first? Now all that may sound horribly shocking and cause one to shudder. But probably that is the only way one can be made to see and realize the great error of the Church's doctrine of the Real Presence.

Besides, the Church takes her "warrant of Scripture" for the literal eating of the flesh of Christ from John 6: 52-57, where Christ was "carnally present"

and gave His hearers to understand that He would give them His "carnal" or literal flesh to eat literally. For how could they otherwise have said: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat" (John 6:53)? And the fact that then Christ repeated the carnally understood precept, instead of telling them He did not mean they were to literally eat His "carnal," literal flesh the same way they ate the flesh they bought "in the shambles of the meat market" (The Real Presence, Rev. Smarius, p. 9), shows that if John 6:52-57 is to be taken in the literal sense at all, the flesh to be eaten and the blood to be drunk must be "carnal" or literal flesh and blood at least to the eyes of faith even if not to the natural eyes. And such being the case, and in view of what we have seen, then is it not still after the manner of cannibalism to partake of Catholic Communion, were there a Real Presence of Christ of any kind in the Eucharist?

Besides, the Church teaches that Christ spoke and forgave as man in the following:

Our Divine Lord performed the miraculous cure (Matt. ix. 6) to convince them that God had communicated this power (of forgiving sins) to man. For He Himself was a perfect man, like unto us in all things save only sin. And He exercised this power not as God, but as man, not in heaven, but here upon earth (Who Can Forgive Sins, Rev. Patrick Denehy, p. 16).

"But," said He, "that you may know that the Son of Man" —He does not say that you may know that the Son of God, but—"that you may know that the Son of Man . . . hath power on earth to forgive sins" . . . Here our Divine Saviour performed a miracle to prove that, even as man, He had the power of forgiving sins (Confession, Rev. Father Damen, S. J. p. 2).

If Christ spoke as man when He spoke of Himself

as "the Son of Man" in Matt. 9:6, then must He not also have spoken as man when He said:

> Except you eat the flesh of the *Son of Man*, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you (John 6:54)?

He did not in that, like He did not in Matt. 9:6 speak of Himself as "the Son of God." If, then, He spoke as man, "not in heaven, but here upon earth," in John 6:53-57 He certainly must have meant the flesh and blood of the "Son of Man" to be literal, carnal flesh and blood, such as His flesh and blood were at the time He spoke to the Jews and as they appeared to them, otherwise they would have been misled, "deceived." For how otherwise could His flesh be "meat indeed, that is, it can be eaten indeed" (The Sacramental Life of the Church, Rev. B. J. Otten, p. 86)? In view of that, would it not still be after the manner of cannibalism to the eyes of faith to communicate were there a Real Presence in the Eucharist?

Again, if Christ spoke as man in John 6:53-57, like He did in Matt. 9:6, then were the Jews not misled, by His repetition, in substance, of 6:53 in verses 54-57, into believing they were to eat and drink His literal, carnal flesh and blood, if Christ at the time had in mind His "glorified Body in Heaven," into which the Church now claims the bread and wine are transubstantiated, and He did not mean His flesh and blood as that of the "Son of Man," "not in heaven, but here upon earth?"

Again, if Christ spoke as the "Son of Man," not as the "Son of God," in John 6:53-57, then the flesh and blood He spoke of must have meant His human flesh and blood, though veiled under bread and wine. If so, then that does not dovetail with the teachings

of the Church that in the Eucharist Christ "is present as a glorified spirit" (Sentinel of The Blessed Sacrament, January, 1908, p. 27), and that it is His "glorified Body in Heaven" which communicants eat and drink, does it? No.

The Church says further, as though Christ were speaking to a Protestant before the Judgment-Seat, the following:

> The Jews "strove among themselves", as unbelievers always have done, "saying, How can this man give us *his flesh to eat!*" Did I hereupon inform them that it was not MY FLESH that I meant to give, but only a figure of my flesh! Or did I *confirm* what I had just before stated? . . . After hearing these *plain* and positive and *repeated declarations* (John vi. 54-58), the Jews could no longer doubt the meaning of my words; but, like thee, they would not believe them. Many of my disciples also, seeing that I really meant to give them *my flesh indeed to eat and my blood indeed to drink,* murmured in like manner at my words and said, "this is a hard saying; who *can* hear it?" (The Protesting Christian Standing Before The Judgment-Seat of Christ, to Answer For The Protest against That Parent Church Which Christ Built Upon a Rock, Rev. J. Perry, p. 48).
>
> And if the Apostles at that time believed the doctrine that Christ would literally give them His flesh to eat, when and where did they ever change their opinion, and where is that important fact recorded? (The Path Which Led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church, Peter H. Burnett, Rev. Jas. Sullivan, S. J., Editor, p. 30).

According to the foregoing, Christ must have spoken as man in John 6:53-58, spoke in the "obvious and literal sense"(The Sacramental Life of The Church, p. 86), and must have meant His literal, carnal, human flesh and blood, such as they appeared to the Jews and the Apostles "at that time," and as literal, carnal and human flesh and blood as the flesh and blood of any other man is; for if otherwise, then they

would have been "deceived," misled. Such being the case, Christ's flesh and blood could not have been or possibly be, and He could not have meant, His "glorified Body in Heaven," that the Jews and the Apostles understood they were to eat and drink. For that discourse, as well as the institution of the Lord's Supper, took place before "His Resurrection." Therefore, Christ either misled them "at that time," or else His literal, carnal, human flesh and blood, though veiled under the "species" of bread and wine, are received in Catholic Communion, and would plainly be seen to be such could one see them with the natural eyes. Such being the case, then is it not still a rank species of cannibalism to receive Catholic Communion?

Again, when Christ is adored in the Eucharist, must not the worshiper represent to himself Christ as being the same as He was when on earth? If so, and this Eucharistic Christ-God, or "God-man," is eaten in Communion, then is it not still after the manner of cannibalism to eat Him in Communion? Yes. At least it would be such could one see Him in the Eucharist as a priest did when he distributed Communion, as may be seen by the following:

"When I distribute holy communion," said Father Paul to a friend of Oostcamp, "it is the infant Jesus, bodily present, that I see in the Host" (Tabernacle and Purgatory, September, 1908, p. 86).

Here Christ is an infant, while "at that time" He was fullgrown, as also His "glorified Body in Heaven" must be. That does not dovetail, does it? If after all, then, one is not to have a "carnal," literal conception of the person of Christ-God, through the eyes of faith, when supposedly receiving Him in Com-

munion, then it would have to be a "mystical" one. And is that not about the same as receiving Him by faith, just as would be the case in the following?

The evening before (Communion), beg of Mary to come and take possession of your heart, in order to prepare it better for the coming of her Son (Frequent and Daily Communion, Father J. Lintelo, S. J., pp. 49, 50).

Through the medium of what matter or "species" is she to "take possession of your heart?" Why, none. Is it not by faith? If so, then why not go a step further and also receive Christ scripturally by faith (Gal. 3:2), without the reception of anything material, the Eucharist, being that He must go from the mouth to the heart of the communicant without the medium of the Eucharist, anyway; for the Eucharist goes into the stomach, not into the heart. He would then, by His Spirit, abide with one all the time, until one chased "Him away by sin," and not only monthly, quarterly or yearly abide with one for about "as much as a quarter of an hour after receiving" (How to Become a Catholic, Rev. George M. Searle, p. 85), when He withdraws His presence "because of the digestion" and destruction by "natural heat," as we saw, of the "material appearances" of bread and wine. And here is the scriptural way, and a comprehensible way, of receiving Christ's Spirit, and having Him abide with us all the time, or till we "chased Him away by sin:"

That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened by his Spirit with might unto the inward man, that Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts (Eph. 3:16, 17).

(That is different from that of dwelling in our hearts by the Eucharist, is it not?)

But you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His (Rom. 8:9).

Would about a "quarter of an hour's" Eucharistic presence of Christ in one once a month, or quarterly, or yearly, make one have "the Spirit of Christ," according to the above? No. To receive the Eucharist, then, in order to have "the Spirit of Christ," is not the scriptural way to have it, is it? No.

Try your ownselves if you be in the faith; prove ye yourselves. Know you not your ownselves, that Christ Jesus is in you, unless perhaps you be reprobates (2 Cor. 13:3)?

According to that, those who do not sin, are not "reprobates," have Christ, that is, His Spirit, always in them, Communion or no Communion of a Eucharist, do they not? Yes. And if so, then can they receive Christ under the veil of the Eucharist when He is already in them, that is, present by His omnipresent and universal spirit?

If anyone love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and make our abode with him (John 14:23).

According to that, Christ and the Father do not abide by the medium of the Eucharist with those who keep His word and love Him; for the Eucharist remains but about fifteen minutes, when it "ceases because of digestion," and surely a fifteen minutes' presence with one can hardly be called an abiding.

And because you are sons, God hath sent the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying: Abba, Father (Gal. 4:6).

My little children, of whom I am in labor again, until Christ be formed in you (Gal. 4:19).

Do we receive "the Spirit of His Son" and have Him "formed in us," by supposedly receiving Him in a Eucharistic Communion? No; but all those operations are by faith, mental acts of the mind and will, without material aids of any kind, a mouth-eating act, receiving Communion. Besides, a presence of Christ for about fifteen minutes in Communion received but once a month, or quarterly, or yearly, and that an "inanimate" Christ, would never form Him, that is, His spirit and character, in anyone. For in order to have anything "formed in us" it requires about a continuous thought or consciousness of the thing to be formed in us. Therefore, if Christ is to be formed in us, we must have a continuous consciousness of His presence, which, of course, can not be had through the Eucharist received in Communion, if His presence ceases with the digestion of the Eucharist, or when it is destroyed by "natural heat."

And he that keepeth His commandments, abideth in Him, and He in him. And in this we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us (1 John 3:24).

If we love one another, God abideth in us, and His charity is perfected in us. . . . And he that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him (John 4:12, 16).

According to that, God does not give us His Spirit, or abide in us, by going to Communion, but gives His Spirit to us and "abideth in us" if we keep His commandments, love one another and abide in charity—love. And those things we can do at all times, so that "God abideth in us" all the time, "till we chase Him away by sin," and not only for the time the Eucharist received in Communion has not yet "ceased because of digestion" or been destroyed by the "natural heat" of the communicant, which time is

about or less "than half an hour after receiving" Communion. And I suppose the hotter or the stronger the "natural heat" the quicker will the "species" be destroyed and the quicker will the presence of Christ also cease. And God can not "dwell by faith in our hearts" (Eph. 3:17) if He leaves as soon as the "species" have "ceased because of digestion," and it is only through the presence of the Eucharist in one that one can have His presence, can He? No. The doctrine of the Real Presence, then, is unscriptural and must be an error.

By the few texts quoted, it may also be seen that Christ did not mean literal flesh and blood in John 6th, but "spirit and life." For they speak of the "Spirit of Christ," which is to be formed and dwell in us. And it is formed in us by a mental operation, not a mouth-eating one; for it says it dwells "by faith in our hearts," and the exercising of faith is a mental operation, an act of the mind and will. And words of faith are as an alkaloid on the mind and heart, and, if one wills to, they will transform one from carnality to spirituality, make one have and live at all times the "spirit and life" of Christ. And when such is the case, then it can be said, as St. Paul said:

> And I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me (Gal. 2:20).

In view, then, of all that we have noted it may easily be seen that to receive Communion in order to have the Spirit of Christ, or to put on His Spirit, "put on Christ," is not the scriptural way of accomplishing them, and that the doctrine of the Real Presence must then be an error, must it not?

Of course, all that we have noted, especially which Christ-God one should adore and worship, the one

supposedly within us when we communicate, or the one still supposedly upon the altar; about God being in the stomach of the communicant; about who or what mutilates and mangles the "living God," and about its being cannibalism to communicate were there a Real Presence of God in the Eucharist, are things the unthinking, or those who have their minds much occupied with work and business, do not think about or ask themselves. For if they did they would readily perceive the great, very great error of the doctrine in question.

To make the error more apparent and to impress it the more deeply upon the mind of the reader, or upon the mind of a communicant, I will make a quotation in which the word "it" is the pronoun of the words "Communion," "Blessed Sacrament," etc. I will substitute for that pronoun the word *God,* in italics, which the Communion, Blessed Sacrament, etc., really are were there a Real Presence in the Eucharist. In doing so I do it with all reverence, simply speaking plainly by calling, as it were, a spade a spade. Did I make the quotation the way I will here for any other reason than that mentioned it certainly would be blasphemous, highly irreverent and sacrilegious, and it is too serious and sacred a thing to Catholics to make light of. The following I will quote in which the words Communion, it, etc., enclosed in parenthesis, are the originals for which I will substitute the word *God* by inserting it after the words in parenthesis, such enclosed words not to be read, but reading instead into the sentences the word *God*:

It is very difficult for the priest to give Communion to people holding their mouths nearly shut without striking (it) *God* against their teeth, in which case it is very probable that

(it) *God* may be broken, or at any rate that some particle of (it) *God* may be knocked off. Don't follow their bad example then, but hold your mouth *wide* open, and your tongue *well out;* then the priest can lay (the Communion) *God* on it without fear, and without danger of accident. When (it) *God* is laid on your tongue, withdraw your tongue immediately, and *then* close your mouth, being careful not to do so till the tongue is inside; then swallow (it) *God* as soon as possible. (It) *God* must not be allowed to *melt in the mouth;* if (it) *God* does, you do not receive the Sacrament at all. If, however (it) *God* should adhere to the roof of the mouth, so that (it) *God* cannot immediately be swallowed, do not be disturbed, but loosen (it) *God* with the tongue; you will pretty certainly be able to do this before (it) *God* is all dissolved. Do not on any account, touch (it) *God* with your fingers. And take care not to chew (it) *God,* or even touch (it) *God* with your teeth. Having swallowed (it) *God* safely, you have now received; and now is the time, more than any other, for fervent prayer, when the Real Presence of our Lord is with you. This Real Presence only remains while (the Blessed Sacrament) *God* still continues undestroyed, which will only be for a few minutes at most, for (it) *God* will usually be acted on more quickly by the stomach than by the mouth; but even after (it) *God* has passed away, prayer and thanksgiving for what has been received should be continued for some time . . . At any rate, one should remain in devotion, if possible, for as much as a quarter of an hour after receiving (How to Become a Catholic, Rev. George M. Searle, pp. 83-85).

By that it may be seen that if *God* does not go into the stomach, but remains in the mouth, one does "not receive the Sacrament"—God. For if God went to one's heart as soon as the Host is received in the mouth, then what difference should that make to God whether the Host remained in the mouth or was swallowed and went into the stomach? Surely, then, God must go into the communicant's stomach, be "corporally" present in it. Shocking! shocking! shocking if such were the case, is it not?

That the way I made the foregoing quotation is not a misrepresentation of the real teachings of the Church may be known by what we have already seen and may further be seen by the following:

Our Lord Himself has rested upon your tongue in Holy Communion (The Catholic News, August 22, 1900).

He comes to us (in Communion) as the very food of our souls; enters our mouths, rests on our tongues, dwells in our hearts (The Sacramental Life of The Church, Rev. Otten, pp. 118, 119)—or rather, dwells in our stomachs, if the Sacrament is not received if the Host is not swallowed.

It is, then, not a misrepresentation of facts, is it, to substitute for the words "the Communion," "Blessed Sacrament," etc., the word *God* the way I did in the foregoing quotation, which is an instruction to a convert to Catholicity as to what to do when receiving Communion; that is, eating and digesting, as it were, God? And is that not really the case if the communicant "feeds upon the blessed body of Jesus"—God, so that then "the blood of a God flows in his veins," and He unites "Himself to us in the Eucharist, unto forming with us one and a same body and a same blood" (Sentinel of The Blessed Sacrament, August, 1908, p. 251), by saying that to receive Communion is to eat and digest God?

I will add a little more, so that the absurdity and erroneousness of the doctrine of the Real Presence may be brought home more closely to the reader, or to a Catholic. Instead of saying, for instance, "I am going to Communion to-day," say, "I am going to eat God to-day." Or, instead of saying, "The children will make their first Communion to-morrow," say, "The children will eat God for the first time to-mor-

row." And is that not really the case, in view of what we have seen? Yes.

In view, then, of all the difficulties, contradictions and absurdities that we noted, which would confront us were the doctrine of the Real Presence true, and which will present themselves to anyone who will stop for a moment to think, or "digs a litle deeper," then the only way out of those difficulties, contradictions and absurdities, or to make them vanish, is to interpret John 6th in the spiritual sense, making it a mental precept of the mind and will, and not a mouth-eating act, and use the word "is" in "This is My body; this is My blood," in the sense that "is" stands for or means 'signifies" or represents; just as that word does in "this is Mary Jones; this is John Smith," etc., when pointing to their pictures. That is without the least shadow of doubt or question the way Christ meant it, and it is the only way and sense in which the word "is" can be used in the matter in question. Christ simply said of the bread and wine that He used in instituting a memorial of remembrance, "This is My body; this is My blood," in order to impress upon His followers the sacredness of His memorial by which He was to be remembered, "until He come."

But, says the Church:

We might take the words, "This is my body", to mean the same as "This is Mary Jones", when said of her picture; but we could not take the words "Hoc est corpus meum", of the Latin version, or "Touto estin to soma mou", of the Greek version, which is *the original*, in the same sense, for the reason that in those languages the pronoun *this* has different forms for the various genders, and if the word for *this* applied to the bread, instead of to the body, it would be represented by *hic* in Latin and

by *houtos* in Greek. *Cf.* July Truth, pp. 68-82 (Truth, February, 1908, p. 264).

In Latin and Greek the pronouns have separate forms for masculine, feminine, and neuter, corresponding to he, she, it. For the pronoun "this", the forms are hic, hæc, hoc in Latin and outos, oute, touto in Greek. . . . Now the words for bread in both these languages are masculine, *panis* in Latin and *artos* in Greek. In both languages, then, they could be represented *only* by a masculine form of the pronoun, "this;" *Hic* in Latin, *outos* in Greek. Both the pronouns actually used, however, are neuter, *Hoc* in Latin, *touto* in Greek. In both languages the word for body is also neuter, *corpus* in Latin, *soma* in Greek. The pronoun can therefore represent only the word body. Our Lord's words then become equivalent, not to "This bread is my body", but to "This body is mine" . . . Since Christ is God, His words, being the words of Omnipotence, effect what they signify, and that when He said, "This is my body", His Almighty word effected what He said. In fact, these very words of our blessed Lord are the strongest proof that one could desire that He meant them in a literal and not a figurative sense. For in using just these words, He speaks of that which He holds in His hands, not as of bread, but as of His very body (Truth, July, 1907, p. 78).

If we follow the same rule of interpretation at the institution of the Lord's Supper that the Church did in Matt. 9:6, then Christ spoke only as man, "not in heaven, but here upon earth," when He said: "This is my body; this is my blood." For at the institution of the Lord's Supper He did not say: "The Son of God indeed goeth as it is written of Him," but said: "The Son of Man indeed goeth as it is written of Him" (Matt. 26:24). Now, if when Christ forgave the man, sick of the palsy, "as man, not in heaven, but here upon earth," because He spoke of Himself on that occasion as "the Son of Man," then did He not also, when He said: "This is my body; this is my blood," speak as man, "not in heaven, but here on earth," because at

the institution of His memorial He spoke of Himself as "the Son of Man?" If so, then how is His supposed flesh and blood that of the flesh and blood of God? Besides, in John 6:54 He also spoke of Himself as "the Son of Man." How, then, does that agree with the claims of the Church that when he said: "This is my body; this is my blood," they were the words of Omnipotence," God? They do not agree at all. Either, then, when Christ forgave the man sick of the palsy He forgave Him as God, and that, then, only God, and no priest, can forgive sin, or else at the institution of the Lord's Supper He spoke simply as man when He said: "This is my body; this is my blood," and that, then, His words were not "the words of Omnipotence." Now which horn of the dilemma will the Church take? But be that as it may, it makes no difference anyway in the matter in question, the words of institution. Now I do not understand the Latin or the Greek language, but it seems it makes no difference whether Christ said: "This is my body," or "This body is mine," or "This my body," just as it makes no material difference whether one says of a picture, "this is Mary Jones," or "this face is Mary Jones." For that is said not of the material composing the picture, but of the representation or likeness. It was the same with Christ when He said: "This is my body," or "This body is mine," or "This my body; this my blood" (A History of The Mass, Rev. O'Brien, p. 327), it merely signified or represented His body and blood given for us, His death on the cross, which was to be remembered when partaking of the memorial He instituted for that purpose, the Lord's Supper, which would "show forth His death until He come" (1 Cor. 11:26). To give it

any other meaning or admit there is a Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, or bread and wine, would be, as we saw, absurd, lead to no end of difficulties and contradictions, and to an unscriptural way of how to secure or have the continuous abiding presence of Christ and having Him, that is His spirit, life and character, "formed in us."

But now it may be asked, if the Eucharist does not contain the body and blood of Christ, and the bread and wine are only as so much blessed bread and wine, such as Christ used at the Last Supper, a mere memorial that shows forth the death of the Lord, "until He come," then how can anyone be—

> Guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and eat and drink judgment to himself (1 Cor. 11:27-31),

by unworthily partaking of the Lord's Supper? He does that who has not proved himself worthy by a Christlike life—not, as the Church teaches, by going to Confession—to partake of the Lord's Supper with those who by a Christ-like life have proved themselves worthy to partake of it, and who are spoken of as "you are the body of Christ"—the Lord (1 Cor. 12:27), and which the unworthy do not discern as a memorial for the worthy only.

There are many who bring condemnation or "judgment to themselves," in church by its true members—the body of the Lord (Eph. 1:22, 23), by partaking of the Lord's Supper, though it consists only of blessed bread and wine, for their hypocritical lives and professions of piety and religion, while at the same time they are anything but Christ-like in charity, patience, honesty, sobriety, etc. When such partake, as some do, of the Lord's Supper they bring "judgment

to themselves" from those who are really and truly Christ-like. For those who know of their un-Christian life and conduct, which they do not seem to amend, or care very much to amend, could say this of them when they partook of the Lord's Supper:

Oh, you hypocrites! You would partake of the Lord's Supper, yet you would not be His disciple in deeds and in "spirit and life" (John 6:64)!

Would that not be a condemnation of such? Yes. By that it may be seen, then, how some bring "judgment to themselves" by partaking of the Lord's Supper, and it may easily be seen how any could be "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" and bring "judgment to themselves" by unworthily partaking of the Lord's Supper, even though there is no Real Presence of Christ in the bread and wine used; just as those "crucifying again to themselves the Son of God" (Heb. 6:6) really do not literally crucify Him again. The texts in question, then, do not support the doctrine of the Real Presence, do they?

It may now also be said that Christ said (John 6:54, 55) that we must eat His flesh, and drink His blood if we want everlasting life, and how can we comply with that precept if there is no literal flesh and blood of Christ of which to partake? Well, that is simply a sensuous or carnal apprehension of what Christ said and meant, and as wrongly understood by the Jews, who had a sensuous and material view of religion, and who on that account nearly always misunderstood the prophecies pertaining to the "promised Son of David," and of the sayings of Christ. For He did not mean that we should literally eat and drink His literal flesh and blood, but to put on His

"spirit and life," just as it did not mean that Ezechiel (Eze. 3:1), and St. John (Apoc. 10:9), should each literally "eat the book" by literally eating, chewing and swallowing its leaves and covers; or, just as it does not mean that one should literally eat a Bible by eating, chewing and swallowing its leaves and covers in order to "taste the good word of God" (Heb. 6:5); although the Church would have us believe that we must literally eat Christ in order to "Taste and see that the Lord is sweet" (Benedictine Parish Monthly, December, 1909, p. 6, etc.).

In an annotation to Eze. 3:1, in her Bible, the Church says:

> By this eating of the book was signified the diligent attention and affection with which we are to receive and embrace the word of God.

Now if to "eat this book," in which no "idea could be expressed in clearer terms than these" (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 332): "Eat this book," does not mean to literally eat a book, but means "the diligent attention and affection with which we are to receive and embrace the word of God," then how does one do that? Does one not do so through the mind and will? Yes. Well, it is the same with to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," that is, eat and drink His "spirit and life." It means to imbibe and assimilate Christ's spirit and life, not by literally eating and drinking in a cannibalistic way the supposed flesh and blood of Christ, but to put Him on, His spirit and life, through an act of the mind and will, without putting anything of material from into the mouth; just as one through the mind and will, without putting anything

of material form into the mouth, "receives and embraces the word of God," or as one would "eat and drink wisdom" (Ecclus. 24:29), or "eat and drink justice" (Matt. 5:6), if one "hungered and thirsted" for them. And is that not reasonable, comprehensible and the true way to put on the spirit and life of anyone, be it that of Christ or of anyone else? Such being the case, then how would you put on the "spirit and life" of Christ; that is, scripturally "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood" (John 6:54), which He later explained to His disciples meant "spirit and life?" How would you, for instance, put on the "spirit and life" of Father Damien, Abraham Lincoln or some Saint? Would you make some eatable representation of him, eat it and then believe by doing so you had put on his spirit and life? No; but you would get a history of his life, containing a description of his spirit, giving his rules of conduct and a narration of the deeds he had done, and do as he did, would you not? Yes. Well, it is the same with putting on the "spirit and life" of Christ. It is to hear or read of them, imbibe them and imitate them through the mind and will—I will be like Christ in spirit and life.

That is what it means to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," and that can be done without partaking of any "species" in a cannibalistic way, mouth-eating way.

Had Christ not spoken in figures and parables, as He usually did to other than His disciples, and had used modern-day language, He would have spoken about as follows:

Except you assimilate with the mind and will the spirit and

life of the Son of Man, and go about doing good, you shall not have everlasting life, or,

He that puts on My spirit through the mind, and followeth My life by an act of the will, and goes about doing good, shall have everlasting life.

That is what Christ meant when He said we must eat His flesh and drink His blood, if we want everlasting life. And to do that is a process of the mind and will, entirely independent of that of putting anything into the mouth and literally eating and swallowing it, so that it goes into the stomach and remains there till the "natural heat" has destroyed its appearances. And is that not the "key" that enables one to easily understand what Christ meant by John 6:52-64?

It may be objected here that if Christ meant what I just said He did, then why did He not say so in the plain terms and way I did? To that it might be replied by asking, Why were not the prophecies pertaining to the promised Messiah given in plain literal words, so that the Jews might have understood them, and said that He would be a spiritual King, who would reign by His Spirit in the hearts of the people, as now understood by most of the churches? Or, why did He not tell St. John to "read the book," instead of telling him to "eat it up," if He meant St. John was not to eat literally the book, but was to read it?

We have to use some reason and common sense in interpreting some passages of Scripture, and John 6:52-64 and Apoc. 10:9 are some of those passages. And reason and common sense tell us that the soul must be reached, fed and nourished through the mind, the assimilating organ of the soul, which receives its food or data through the channels of either hearing

or seeing or both(Gal. 3:2). When that is once seen and understood then the fallacy and utter futility may be seen of trying to feed, nourish and strengthen the soul, or putting on the spirit and life of anyone, through putting certain blessed things into the mouth and swallowing them, or through putting them on the external body. To feed the body one must put natural food, through the avenue of the mouth, into the stomach, the receiving and assimilating organ of the body. Likewise, then, to feed the soul one must put spiritual food, words of faith and truth, the "bread of life," into the assimilating organ of the soul, which is the mind, understanding, and which receives its food through the channel of either the eye or the ear, by either reading or hearing the Gospel and spirit and life of Christ, and then assimilating them through an operation of the mind and following them by an act of the will. It is the word that reaches the soul, cuts to the quick, cuts deeper than the sword; that is, material forces or blows upon the external body. The same is it with "eating" words of faith and truth and with putting on the spirit and life of Christ, acquiring grace or administering it (Eph. 4:29; 1 Pet. 4:10, 11; 2 Cor. 3:3, 6). And were not that the operation and meaning when Christ said we must eat and drink His flesh and blood, in order to obtain everlasting life, "enter into the kingdom of God," then what becomes of those good Catholic children who die without ever receiving Communion? For the Church does not permit children in this country under twelve (12) years of age to receive Communion, and it makes no difference if a child is bright and even in the sixth grade in the school, and though eleven (11) years and nine (9) months old when a class makes its First Com-

munion, of which I know of such cases, it cannot make its first Communion so long as it has not reached the full age of twelve years.*

Of course, that is one of the laws of the Church by which she manages to keep the children in her parish or parochial schools as long as possible and while the mind of the child is still flexible or pliable and in the indelibly impressive and formative period, the period during which a belief when once impressed upon the mind it becomes almost indelibly stamped upon it and can then only be eradicated by a severe shock of one kind or another upon the mind, as was the case with me when I became afflicted and the occasion for reading much for pastime was made.

But be that as it may, if the precept of John 6:54, which says:

> Amen, amen, I say to you: Except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you,

is a positive precept and were interpreted literally in every way as the Church interprets John 3:5, which says:

> Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,

and which the Church interprets to mean a baptism by water that is indispensable even to the salvation of—

> The infant a day old, as well as for the adult (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 305),

then all children, no matter how good they may be, who die under twelve years of age, and who had not

---

* See Appendix.

been permitted by the Church to make their first Communion, could not enter into the kingdom of God, could not obtain everlasting life, would not be "raised up in the last day," just as children dying under twelve years of age without Baptism, no matter how good they might have been, cannot supposedly enter into the kingdom of God, have everlasting life, be "raised up in the last day." For the precept of John 6:54, 55 is just as positive a one as John 3:5, both having been given and enjoined with an exactly similar oath, and neither one has a provision stating that the one may be dispensed with if the other is received. In view of that, then, if Baptism is indispensable to the salvation of infants then Communion must also be, must it not? Yes. What, then, becomes of those children who die, for instance, between the ages of seven and twelve years, who die without ever having received Communion, having literally complied with the precept of John 6:54, 55, because the Church does not permit them to receive Communion, and if to literally "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," is a positive precept that without a literal compliance with it no one shall "have life in him," obtain "everlasting life," "enter into the kingdom of God," be "raised up in the last day"? Ask a Catholic cleric for an answer to that question and he will probably reply by saying:

> Pray, sir, which was the first, the chicken or the egg?

Yet St. Paul said:

> Understand what I say; for the Lord will give thee in all things understanding (2 Tim. 2:7).

As that certainly does not have reference to ma-

terial, but to spiritual, things, then have clerics, who are supposed to "feed us with knowledge" (Jer. 3:15), "understanding," when they reply to legitimate spiritual questions by saying: "Pray sir, which was the first, the chicken or the egg?"

And how are we fed "with knowledge?" Is it by putting certain things into the mouth, as Catholics do when they "feed upon the blessed body of Jesus," in order to "have everlasting life," put on the spirit and life of Christ?

But be that as it may, probably it will be said, as Truth said when speaking of what Pope Leo XIII said about those who alone can "fulfill the duties of a Christian life," that Christ had in mind, in John 6:54, 55, only those who have "arrived at or near adult age," and that the precept did not include infants. For Truth said:

> To the objection he bases upon the quotation from Pope Leo XIII, "He alone is able to fulfill the duties of a Christian life", we reply that they apply only to those called upon actually to "fulfill the duties", among which are only included in the Pope's mind, and in the mind of all others when speaking on such subjects, those arrived at or near adult age (Truth, February, 1908, p. 264).

Are only "those arrived at or near adult age" required to "fulfill the duties of a Christian life" of obedience, patience, labor, kindness, forgiveness, resisting temptation, etc.? Are not children of the age of reason and accountability, that is, from about seven to twelve years of age, required to "fulfill the duties of a Christian life" of about the same kind, with a few minor exceptions? Yes. If, then, the Pope had in mind only "those arrived at or near adult age" when he said that—

He alone is able to fulfill the duties of a Christian life who has put on Christ, and Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table (Quoted in Catholic News, April 4, 1900),

then why may not Christ also have had in mind only "those arrived at or near adult age" when He said?

Amen, amen I say to thee, unless a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. . . . The spirit breatheth where he will; and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he cometh, and whither he goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit (John 3:3, 8).

Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned (Mark 16:15, 16).

if Christ had in mind only "those arrived at or near adult age," twelve years of age, or over twelve, when He said:

Amen, amen, I say to you: Except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day (John 6:54, 55)?—(He that eateth NOT my flesh, and drinketh NOT my blood, hath NOT everlasting life: and I will NOT raise him up in the last day).

This is what the Church says about Baptism:

The Church teaches that Baptism is necessary for all, for infants as well as for adults, and her doctrine rests on the following grounds: Our Lord says to Nicodemus: (Here quotes John 3:5). These words embrace the whole human family, without regard to age or sex (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 307).

Now if unconscious infants regardless of "age or sex," who do not know of anything but a few necessary instincts, and who cannot "hear His (Holy

Spirit's) voice," and who cannot choose to believe or not to believe, were "included in Christ's mind" when He spoke as in John 3:5, 8 and Mark 16:15, 16, then why were not such infants also "included in Christ's mind" when He spoke as in John 6:54, 55? Can an infant about ten days old hear the voice of the Spirit, when it cannot even hear or understand the voice of a human being? No. Why, then, is it baptized but not given Communion, even sometimes being baptized when it is only a few hours old and it is believed it will not live? Where is the authority for administering the one and not the other to infants? One could with as much right say the following about the necessity of Communion for infants, as the Church says about the necessity of Baptism for infants:

> Communion is necessary for all, for infants as well as for adults and the doctrine rests on the following grounds: Our Lord says to the Jews: "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever. Except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. These words embrace the whole human family, without regard to age or sex.

Now, in view of that, where is the "warrant of Scripture" for administering Baptism, but not Communion, to infants, "without regard to age or sex?" The Church can always cite scriptural warrant for doing or for not doing a certain thing. Where, then, is the "warrant of Scripture," and the rule of interpretation, for administering Baptism, but not Communion, to infants and children, if both precepts are to be interpreted literally? The Church cannot cite Matt. 16:19; for then she could with as much right and authority abolish infant Baptism. The Church says further:

Our Lord knows equally, and far better than we do, that innocence is the most precious of all treasures, that Satan seeks to rob children of it early, and that Communion alone can protect them from the wiles of the enemy—Mgr. de Segur (Messenger of the Sacred Heart, July, 1909, p. 401).

Then Jesus said to them: "Amen, amen, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you". You shall never be saved, you shall never see eternal life (Transubstantiation, Rev. Father Damen, p. 7).

As children, according to the Church, can at about the age of seven years commit mortal sins, be robbed of their innocence by Satan, and if "Communion alone can protect" innocent children "from the wiles of the enemy," Satan, and without Communion "you shall never be saved, you shall never see eternal life," then why is Communion not now given to children as it was "in the primitive days of the Church?" Was it believed "in the primitive days" that without Communion infants, children, would "never be saved, never see eternal life," but now they will without it? If so, then has the Church not changed? It cannot be claimed that the administering of Communion to infants, and its abolition later, was and is "only a matter of discipline," and that Matt. 16:19 is the authority for the Church's action. For then the administering of Baptism to infants could also be said to be "only a matter of discipline," and could at any time be abolished without affecting the salvation of infants and children under twelve years of age. For the Scripture precepts for the administering of Communion to infants are just as strong as those for administering Baptism to them. So that, then, if one is "only a matter of discipline," the other is also "only a matter of discipline." Such being the case, then why does

the Church not administer Communion to infants, or else also discontinue administering Baptism to them, and not administer it to them until they are able to believe, if they must be old enough to "discern the body of the Lord" before Communion can be administered to them now?

But it may be said, as one wrote me:

> Those are not to commune who are not capable of *discerning* the body of the Lord, hence the exclusion of children.

If such is the case, then it may with just as much justification be said:

> Those are not to be baptized who are not capable of hearing the voice of the Spirit (John 3:8) and of believing (Mark 16:16).

Are ten-day-old infants capable of those two things, being that the Church usually baptizes them at or about that age? No. The argument, then, for the reason for the "exclusion of children" from Communion is not tenable, for the same kind of argument would also exclude children from Baptism.

Again, if "those are not to Commune who are not capable of discerning the body of the Lord" then why did the Church communicate children in the "primitive days of the Church?"

> In the primitive days of the Church, the Holy Communion used to be imparted to infants, but only in the form of wine. The priest dipped his finger in the consecrated chalice, and gave it to be sucked by the infant (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 347).
>
> For a long time it was customary to communicate children, under the species of wine, immediately after their baptism. This used to be done by the priest dipping his finger in the Precious Blood and then putting it into the child's mouth to suck (A History of the Mass, Rev. John O'Brien, A. M., p. 378).

Could the infants "in the primitive days of the Church" "discern the body of the Lord," but cannot do so now when it is claimed that now the intelligence of the people and children is above that which it was "in the primitive days," because they were given Communion then, whilst those of the present day are not given it?

Of course, the Church has wrongly interpreted what it means to be "born again," just as she has wrongly interpreted what it means to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," and just as the Jews wrongly interpreted the prophecies, believing—

> The promised Son of David was to be a great temporal prince, that He was to free the Jewish people, and establish a great Jewish Empire (Notes on Ingersoll, Rev. L. A. Lambert, pp. 140, 141),

and who was to sit upon the literal throne upon which David sat.

The Church says this about Baptism:

> Our Lord here (John iii. 5; Matt. xxviii. 19) makes no distinction about who is to be baptized; and the word which He uses does not simply mean a member of the male sex, but all human individuals. Now the size of a person does not constitute a man; and as soon as a child has a soul it has human nature. They might easily know this from Holy Writ; for it was said by Christ that a woman rejoices at the birth of her child because a man is born into the world. Here Christ makes no distinction of sex or age [neither did He in John vi. 54, 55] which shows how He used the word man. But it has been objected to me that Christ required faith for baptism, and that a child cannot have faith. Of course they wish us to take the assertion for proof. Now the child has many faculties which it cannot use because they are undeveloped. It has two legs, and cannot walk. It has an intelligent soul, and cannot reason. These are powers

which God has given it in the natural order, which it is totally unable to exercise. But on your theory it cannot receive them. Now why cannot God endow that soul with faith as well as reason? One is no more difficult than the other. True, its faith would have to be developed hereafter, but so must its reason, if you do not wish it to grow up an unthinking animal (The Question Box, Rev. F. G. Lentz, pp. 118, 119).

If, then, "Christ makes no distinction of sex or age which shows how He used the word man," when speaking of the necessity of Baptism, and the soul of an infant is endowed "with faith" sufficient to believe in Baptism, so as to be baptized, then does not the word man in John 6:52 "not simply mean a member of the male sex, but all human individuals without distinction of sex or age?" If so, and the soul of an infant is endowed "with faith" sufficient to receive Baptism—which would make it be also endowed "with faith" sufficient to receive Communion—then why is it not given Communion as well as Baptism, as "in the primitive days of the Church?"

According to the interpretations the Church places on John 3:5, 8; Mark 16:15, 16 and John 6:54, 55, they ought to read as follows:

Unless a man, from a day old on up, be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. . . . The Spirit breatheth where He will; and thou, from a day old on up, hearest His voice, etc.

Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature from a day old on up. He, from a day old on up, that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he, from a day old on up, that believeth not, etc.

Except you, from twelve years old on up, eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He, from twelve years old on up, that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up in the last day.

But Christ made no such distinctions, and, as the texts stand, one is just as imperative a precept, and as indispensable to salvation, as the other. And the very arguments that can be adduced for the administering of infant Baptism can also be adduced in favor of infant Communion; and the very arguments that can be produced against infant Communion can also be produced against infant Baptism. Now, why does the Church not administer the one to infants as well as the other, as she did "in the primitive days of the Church?" It must be because she is changeable in her beliefs, teachings and practices, must it not? Yes. Yet she claims that she has never changed her belief in anything regarded as essential to salvation, that she is infallible and that—

> If only one instance could be given in which the Church ceased to teach a doctrine of faith which had been previously held, that single instance would be the death-blow of her claim of infallibility (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 96).

Has not "that single instance" been given which apparently shows she must at one time have believed Communion was indispensable to the salvation of infants, because she at one time administered it to them, but does not believe so now, because she does not administer it to them any longer? If so, then has she not "ceased to teach a doctrine of faith which had been previously held?" Yes. The Church, then, is not unchangeable, and if not unchangeable then she is not infallible, is she? Hardly.

The Church may in reply to that say that it is not because she is not unchangeable in her beliefs of essential doctrines and rites, that she has ceased to

impart Communion to infants, but because of the danger of spilling some of the supposed blood of Christ in imparting it to them; as though it could not have been spilled "in the primitive days," but can now. But such a reply would not hold good in view of the following:

> Silence should be observed in the Sacristies; or, at least, we should speak in a low voice, because the Sacristy is part of the Church, and it might be that our Lord is there really present in some small particle of the consecrated Host, adhering to the sacred linens (Little Catechism of Liturgy, Rev. A. M. Cheneau, p. 17),

as though the Lord would not want us to speak to others in His presence. Will it be the same in Heaven?

If, then, the Lord is "really present in some small particle of the consecrated Host," which particle may be as small as a pin head, "adhering to the sacred linens," which are later soaked in water and washed, then is it any more sacrilegious, or whatever it may be called, for some small quantity of His "Precious Blood" to be spilled upon the face or upon the clothes of infants when imparting it to them in Communion than to have the Christ "adhering to the sacred linens" soaked in the water of a washtub, or in whatever they are washed? I do not believe that it is. But it may be said Christ withdraws His presence before the "sacred linens" are soaked in water. Well, could He not do the same from the wine that might be spilled in administering Communion to infants?

Neither can the Church claim that she ceased administering Communion to infants because she has made a ruling or regulation that one must now be instructed, must understand what Communion is and

must be "capable of discerning the body of the Lord," before one can receive it. For then it might be asked, Was not the Church guided by the Holy Spirit "in the primitive days," so that she would have known that one must be instructed about Communion and be "capable of discerning the body of the Lord" before one could receive it, or that she did not know how to teach salvation and its full requirements, because she at that time gave Communion to infants?

In view, then, of what we have noted, may we not reasonably infer that the reason she has ceased to give Communion to infants is because she has changed in her belief with regard to the necessity of infant Communion, and has, therefore, also "ceased to teach a doctrine of faith which had been previously held?" Yes. Has not, then, "that single instance been given," which, if it "could be given would be the death-blow of her claim of infallibility?"

The Church has also changed with regard to her attitude towards suicides. At one time she would under no consideration permit a suicide, to commit suicide she then regarded as "a heinous crime" (Frequent and Daily Communion, Father Lintelo, S. J., p. 12), to be buried from the Church, while now some are buried with the full funeral rites of the Church. The Church, then, is not unchangeable, nor infallible, is she? Hardly.

The Church says the following:

> May the whole church, and each one of the faithful, grow in wisdom and knowledge; not altering, but advancing in the same doctrine, mind and faith. The doctrine of divine philosophy of Christianity may be developed, defined, and perfected, but they cannot be altered, diminished, or mutilated without sin. They may, indeed, gain additional proof, light, and definiteness, but

to do so they must retain their fulness, integrity, and essence.—Vincent of Lerins (Spiritual Pepper and Salt, Right Rev. Wm. Stang, D. D., p. 115).

If, then, doctrines "cannot be altered, diminished, or mutilated," and "they must retain their fulness, integrity, and essence," then has the doctrine of infant Communion of the "primitive days" not been "altered, diminished and mutilated," by not now administering Communion to infants? And is it "advancing in the same doctrine" to discontinue a practice of the primitive days of the Church? If so, then why not discontinue the practice of infant Baptism, and say by doing so, the Church is "advancing in the same doctrine, mind and faith?"

CHAPTER IV.

In order to see what answer the Church would make to the question of why Communion, based on John 6:54, is not as indispensable to the salvation of infants as she regards Baptism to be, and why Communion was imparted to infants in the primitive days, I wrote to Truth about that. It answered as follows, which I will quote in sections and comment on as I quote them:

> The words in John iii. 5 refer to admission into the kingdom of God, that is, the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, which is necessary to salvation. Those in John vi. 54 refer to the life of grace, and more especially to its *preservation* in our souls. The life of grace is conferred by baptism, and can only be lost by mortal sin (Truth, October, 1907, p. 162).

That the "kingdom of God" does not mean the Church may be seen by the following: Matt. 6:33; 19:24; 21:31; Mark 9:47; 10:14; John 3:3; etc. But be that as it may, if Communion is necessary "to its preservation in our souls of that life of grace conferred by baptism," then should not all baptized children between the ages of seven and twelve years, who can commit mortal sins at about seven years of age, receive Communion for the "preservation in their souls of that life of grace conferred by baptism"? And are not infants or children to-day, in this age of growing indifferentism and irreligion, in as great need of "additional graces" as were the infants of the primitive days of the Church? If so, then why does the Church not

impart Communion to them now, if she is not changeable in her teachings and practices of divine rites? It must be because she is apparently changeable.

Again, if the life of grace is conferred by baptism —which no doubt means by baptism only—and the "life of grace is lost by mortal sin," then why is one not re-baptized that one may again receive the life of grace? For there is just as much "warrant of Scripture" for frequent Baptism as there is for frequent Communion, which the Church is now exhorting her members to practice; or, there is no more "warrant of Scripture" for frequent Communion, so that one may "have everlasting life," than there is for frequent Baptism.

Again, what "life" is meant in John 6:54? Is it not, in one sense of the word, the "life of grace?" Yes. For to have "everlasting life" (John 6:55) one must have and die in grace, or state of grace. Such being the case, then how did Christ say that "life of grace" is received, "conferred?" Did He say, by being "born again," being baptized? No. And in John 3:3-8 He said nothing about any kind of "life." But He said it is obtained, "conferred," by eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Son of Man, which the Church has interpreted to mean receiving Communion. Now, in view of that, is Truth not mistaken when it says the "life of grace is conferred by baptism," and that John 6:54 refers "to its preservation in our souls?" Yes. And if anything is patent as to where and how the "life of grace is conferred" it is by Communion rather than by Baptism. For Christ said nothing about "life" in John 3:3-8, but He did in John 6:54. Therefore, if one will not have "everlasting life"

unless one has and is in the "life of grace," and this "life of grace" is not received, "conferred,"

Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood (John 6:54).

then is Communion not necessary for the salvation of all, and make it even more necessary than Baptism? If so, then why does the Church not administer Communion to infants now as she did in the "primitive days of the Church," so that they may receive the "life of grace" that is necessary for the obtaining of "everlasting life," and that they may be "raised up in the last day?" It must be because she is changeable, must it not?

And in view of what we have seen, Communion, then, if not more necessary than Baptism for the salvation of infants, is, at the least, just as necessary for their salvation. There is no way to turn and twist out of that conclusion if John 6:52-59 is to be interpreted in the literal sense, and means a mouth-eating and drinking operation, receiving Catholic Communion.

There is a vast difference between the meaning of these two expressions "to enter into the kingdom of God", and to "have life in you". The one lays down the conditions for "entering into life", and is, therefore, of universal application, the other lays down the condition of continuing in that "life of grace", and therefore is not so extensive in application (Ibid., p. 162).

By reading the verse following the one containing the "expression," "have life in you," which reads as follows:

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life and I will raise him up in the last day (John 6:55),

it may be seen that there is really no difference between their meaning. For if one does not comply with the conditions of John 6:54, 55, if taken in the literal sense, and as literally as John 3:3, 5, then one will not have "everlasting life," and he will NOT be raised "up in the last day" to "enter the kingdom of God," heaven. It would be the same as with one who did not comply with the conditions of John 3:5, he would NOT be raised "up in the last day" to "enter the kingdom of God," heaven. As the two precepts read, each one stands alone. For Christ said nothing about being "born again" when He spoke as narrated in John 6:54, 55; and said nothing about to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man" when he spoke as recorded in John 3:3, 5, 8, so that each stands alone, and one will have salvation by complying with either precept, or else both are necessary for salvation. There is, then, really no difference "between the meaning of these two expressions" to "enter into the kingdom of God," or to "see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3)—which certainly does not mean, as Truth claims, "the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ," for we can SEE the Church even if we do not become members of it by not being baptized—and to "have life in you," "everlasting life." John 6:54 is then just as "universal of application" as John 3:5, is it not, when taken in the literal sense? Yes. And no doubt that was the view of the Church "in the primitive days," and that, then, was the reason the Church imparted Communion to infants, "but only in the form of wine." The Church, then, is changeable, is she not? Yes, most evidently so.

Again, the exact force of the "except" in John vi. 54 is evident the moment we read it in its context. It was said to

the Jews who refused to accept His words literally, and means: "If you refuse to eat," "if you contemn the eating". (Here quotes John vi. 53, 54). Our correspondent will also note that in the quotation on baptism our Saviour uses the third person, "Unless a man"—any one of the human race—which is absolutely universal; whereas, in regard to Holy Communion He uses only the second person—"Except *you* shall eat", etc., which is not universal absolutely (Ibid., p. 162).

We will now see whether or not the "person" Christ used in either case really makes any difference in the "force of the 'except' in John vi. 54," and of the "unless a man" in John 3:5, by changing the "persons" in them.

Except *you* be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, you cannot enter into the kingdom of God (John 3:5).

Unless a man eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, he shall not have life in him (John 6:54). (Which is in substance what Christ said in verse 52, where He "uses the third person".)

I will also quote verse 55 in the same way.

You that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise *you* up in the last day.

Now, does the changing of the "persons" in the foregoing change the meaning or "universal application" of either of the two precepts in question? No. Note also how Christ changed from the "second person" in verse 54 to the "third person" in verse 55, showing that John 6:54, 55 is as "absolutely universal" as Truth claims John 3:5 is. Christ simply spoke in the third person to Nicodemus because it is a more feeling or kind way of speaking to a person than to speak to one in the "second person," especially when speaking to one person only, as was the case with Nicodemus. With the Jews however it was different,

because He spoke to many instead of to one, using the second person as well as the third person in speaking to them. And had they not striven "among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat," then Christ would not have given utterance to verse 54, which is in the second person, and His whole discourse would then have been in the third person. For by cutting out verse 54 the whole discourse supposedly about Communion is in the third person, showing that Christ then did not "in regard to Holy Communion use only the second person." Any one who cares to go to the trouble to look up that discourse will see that such is the case, and he ought not to be blinded by the statements of Truth that "in regard to Holy Communion Christ uses only the second person" and "which is not universal absolutely" for all, including infants, if John 3:5 is "universal absolutely" for all, including infants.

John 6:54, 55, then, when taken in the literal sense as the Church does John 3:5, is just as "universal absolutely" as John 3:5, is it not? Yes. Why, then, does the Church not administer Communion now to infants as she did "in the primitive days of the Church," when she apparently believed Communion was as indispensable to the salvation of infants, by administering it to them at that time, as she now believes Baptism is? It must be because she apparently is changeable in her beliefs and teachings and practices of divine rites. There is no other way to account for it.

In my letter to Truth I quoted His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, which is the reason for the following:

ble. But is she such a Church? No, not by a good deal. And has not "that single instance" been given "in which the Church ceased to teach a doctrine of faith which had been previously held," which, if it "could be given," "would be the death-blow of her claim of infallibility?"

Again, where is there any more warrant of Scripture" for the reception of Communion more than once, so that one may have "everlasting life," than there is for the reception of Baptism but once, so that one might "see the kingdom of God?" For the Church teaches that Baptism can be received but once. The Church cannot claim Luke 22:19 or 1 Cor. 11:26 as "warrants of Scripture" for the reception of Communion more than once, so that one may have "everlasting life." For those texts exhort the commemoration of and show the "death of the Lord, until He come," which is quite a different end and purpose from that of eating "the flesh of the Son of Man," so that one may have "everlasting life." For to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," is something that effects for us or results in "everlasting Life," while to partake of the Lord's Supper simply shows "the death of the Lord, until He come." One has no more to do with the other than to be "born again" has to do with to "show the death of the Lord, until He come," thus showing that they are two quite distinct precepts and different in their character, application and results, and just as distinct from each other as John 3:5 is from Matt. 26:26-29. Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:26, then, are not "warrants of Scripture" for the reception of Communion, eating "the flesh of the Son of Man," more than once, so that one may have "everlasting life." Where, then, is the "warrant of

Scripture" for the reception of Communion, "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," more than once, so that one may have "everlasting life?" There is none if there is none for the reception of Baptism but once, so that one may be "born again," receive the Holy Ghost, after one has lost the "life of grace" and "chased away by sin" the Holy Ghost.

But it may be said that "the Eucharist is both a sacrament and sacrifice" (Clearing the Way, Rev. Xavier Sutton, p. 103), and that therefore John 6:54-58, Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:26 mean one and the same thing, and that, therefore, the latter two passages are the "warrants of Scripture" for the reception of Communion more than once, or for receiving it frequently, so that one may have "everlasting life." If that is the case, then every one can offer the sacrifice; for Christ addressed laymen, not clerics, in John 6:54, 55, and St. Paul likewise addressed laymen, not clerics, in 1 Cor. 11:23-26. But the Church does not admit that laymen can offer the sacrifice (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 345), the Mass, as the Church calls it, and that only her clerics can offer it. Such being the case, then, Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:26 are not "warrants of Scripture" for more than once to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," so that one may have "everlasting life," are they? No.

Again, if Baptism, as we saw, "refers to admission into the Church, which is necessary for salvation," then how is an apostate, or an excommunicate, who certainly is completely outside of the "kingdom of God," the Church, who repents and wants to re-enter the Church, re-enter the "kingdom of God," the Church, without being re-baptized, if Baptism can be received but once and it is only by Baptism that

ble. But is she such a Church? No, not by a good deal. And has not "that single instance" been given "in which the Church ceased to teach a doctrine of faith which had been previously held," which, if it "could be given," "would be the death-blow of her claim of infallibility?"

Again, where is there any more warrant of Scripture" for the reception of Communion more than once, so that one may have "everlasting life," than there is for the reception of Baptism but once, so that one might "see the kingdom of God?" For the Church teaches that Baptism can be received but once. The Church cannot claim Luke 22:19 or 1 Cor. 11:26 as "warrants of Scripture" for the reception of Communion more than once, so that one may have "everlasting life." For those texts exhort the commemoration of and show the "death of the Lord, until He come," which is quite a different end and purpose from that of eating "the flesh of the Son of Man," so that one may have "everlasting life." For to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," is something that effects for us or results in "everlasting Life," while to partake of the Lord's Supper simply shows "the death of the Lord, until He come." One has no more to do with the other than to be "born again" has to do with to "show the death of the Lord, until He come," thus showing that they are two quite distinct precepts and different in their character, application and results, and just as distinct from each other as John 3:5 is from Matt. 26:26-29. Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:26, then, are not "warrants of Scripture" for the reception of Communion, eating "the flesh of the Son of Man," more than once, so that one may have "everlasting life." Where, then, is the "warrant of

Scripture" for the reception of Communion, "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," more than once, so that one may have "everlasting life?" There is none if there is none for the reception of Baptism but once, so that one may be "born again," receive the Holy Ghost, after one has lost the "life of grace" and "chased away by sin" the Holy Ghost.

But it may be said that "the Eucharist is both a sacrament and sacrifice" (Clearing the Way, Rev. Xavier Sutton, p. 103), and that therefore John 6:54-58, Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:26 mean one and the same thing, and that, therefore, the latter two passages are the "warrants of Scripture" for the reception of Communion more than once, or for receiving it frequently, so that one may have "everlasting life." If that is the case, then every one can offer the sacrifice; for Christ addressed laymen, not clerics, in John 6:54, 55, and St. Paul likewise addressed laymen, not clerics, in 1 Cor. 11:23-26. But the Church does not admit that laymen can offer the sacrifice (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 345), the Mass, as the Church calls it, and that only her clerics can offer it. Such being the case, then, Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:26 are not "warrants of Scripture" for more than once to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," so that one may have "everlasting life," are they? No.

Again, if Baptism, as we saw, "refers to admission into the Church, which is necessary for salvation," then how is an apostate, or an excommunicate, who certainly is completely outside of the "kingdom of God," the Church, who repents and wants to re-enter the Church, re-enter the "kingdom of God," the Church, without being re-baptized, if Baptism can be received but once and it is only by Baptism that

anyone can ever be or must be admitted into the Church? If Baptism cannot be received but once, in order to "enter the kingdom of God, that is, the Church," then Communion also cannot be received but once, in order to obtain "everlasting life." For it no more says:

> As often as you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you shall have everlasting life; and I will raise you up in the last day,

than it says:

> As often as you are born again of water and the Holy Ghost, you shall enter into the kingdom of God,

"that is, the Church, the Body of Christ." Where, then, is the "warrant of Scripture" for more than once to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," so that one may have "everlasting life," and be "raised up in the last day," if there is no "warrant of Scripture" that one can be baptized more than once, so that one may be "born again" of the Holy Ghost, when after the reception of Baptism one has "chased Him away by sin and enthroned Satan in His place," or when one who is an apostate or has been excommunicated, repents and wants to re-enter the Church, or has lost "the life of grace by mortal sin"—who is certainly spiritually dead and needs to be "born again"—and wants to re-gain it, be made spiritually alive again?

The Church claims John 6:54 as the "warrant of Scripture" for more than once to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," etc., as may be seen by the following:

> It would be difficult to conceive in what way Rome could have shown greater keenness for the wholesale adoption of

this "salutary practice" (of daily Communion), that is to say, short of giving a positive command. That, however, it cannot do, since it cannot go back of the Divine precept to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood", which only binds us under sin to an annual Communion, and to Viaticum before death, if that is feasible—F. D. Zulueta, S. J. (Messenger of The Sacred Heart, June, 1909, p. 337).

If, then, John 6:54 "binds us under sin to to an annual Communion"—which is indeed strange the Church did not discover that fact till the Fourth Council of Lateran, 1215 A. D.—and "to Viaticum before death, if that is feasible," then the same claim can be made for Baptism, according to John 3:5, and one should be baptized annually and at the hour of death, "if that is feasible." For whatever interpretation, as to how often it may be received, is placed upon John 6:54 can also be placed upon 3:5, and *vice versa.* Is that not evidently so? Yes. As John 6:54, then, is not a "warrant of Scripture," the "Divine precept," for receiving Communion more than once, in order that one may have "everlasting life," be raised "up in the last day," then where is the "warrant of Scripture" for more than once complying with the precept of John 6:54, 55, if there is no "warrant of Scripture" for more than once complying with the precept of John 3:5, 8? There is none; and that proves that the Church has wrongly interpreted what it means to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," so that one may have everlasting life, and proves that one must put on the "spirit and life" of Christ, so that one may have "everlasting life," in the manner or way already stated; that is, by a mental act and will, and not by a mouth-eating act. And that anyone, even children under twelve years of age, who have reached

the age of reason and accountability, supposed to be about the age of seven years, can do without literally partaking with the mouth of the supposed flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, after the manner of cannibalism, and which then goes into the stomach and is destroyed by its "natural heat," causing then the presence of Christ also to "cease because of digestion;" although a Catholic layman believes, as we saw—

That after a *worthy* Holy Communion Christ is and remains in your soul as long as you do not chase Him away by sin and enthrone Satan in His place.

Again, Christ said in the same discourse:

I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst (John 6:34).

How does one satisfy soul hunger and thirst? Does one put something of material form or appearance into the mouth in order to satisfy or reach the soul? Does one, for instance, satisfy one's love for an absent loved one by eating the loved one's letter, or by eating with the mouth something representing the loved one, the photograph, for instance? No; for the soul's yearnings, hunger and thirst, are not reached and satisfied through the avenue of the mouth, but they are reached and satisfied through the mind. It is the same with the hunger and thirst of the soul for the "bread of life." And the "bread of life" is no more of literal or natural bread form or appearance, that can literally be eaten with the mouth, than is the "leaven of malice and wickedness," with which one should not "feast,' and the "unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. 5:8). with which one should

"feast," of natural bread form or appearance that can be "feasted" upon by the mouth. But they are mental conditions, activities or operations of the mind and will. And such is the "feasting" on the "bread of life" by the soul that hungers and thirsts for the "meat which endureth unto life everlasting," which "everlasting life" the "Son of Man will give you" (John 6:27). And this "meat which endureth unto life everlasting" are laid up "treasures in heaven: where neither the rust nor moth doth consume" (Matt. 6:20), the eternal reward for which we should labor, instead of laboring for temporal reward, "the meat which perisheth" (John 6:27), and does not mean the supposed literal "meat," flesh and blood of Christ, for which we do not have to "labour" (John 6:27), it being prepared for us by clerics, which we are to "consume" or eat and drink with the mouth, supposedly satisfying then the hunger and thirst of those who want life everlasting. For that hunger and thirst are not literal physical cravings or desires that can be satisfied through putting something into the mouth, but they are yearnings and desires of the soul and mind, and they must be reached through the mind, understanding, which receives its food through the avenues of the senses of seeing or hearing or both. As, then, the hunger and thirst Christ spoke of in John 6:35 are not literal or of the body that receives its food through the channel of the mouth and throat, but are of the soul and mind, then the "bread of life" also is not of literal or natural bread form or appearance. For the first part of John 6:35 cannot be taken literally or in the carnal sense and the remainder of it figuratively.

Again, if the "meat," for which Christ said we should labor, and "which endureth unto life everlast-

ing," is the Eucharist, the Church's "bread of life," "which the Son of Man will give you," then why receive it "frequently, and even daily," unless one "chases Christ (the supposed "bread of life") away by sin and enthrones Satan in His place?" Would it be enduring "unto life everlasting," and would it be "imperishable meat," if one could "consume" it to nothingness, so that one would have to receive it again and again and again, or, if on the destruction of the "species" by "natural heat" or "digestion," Christ makes His presence, the "bread of life," to cease existence within one? No. It is evident, then, that what He would give us is "life everlasting," the "meat" of eternal reward, not the Eucharist, the Church's "bread of life," thus also making the "bread of life" not of material form or appearance, as the Church does. The "bread of life," then, is not of natural bread appearance, but is the teachings of Christ, the Gospel, and His "spirit and life" as a model or example for us to emulate. Such being the case, then all children of the age of reason and accountability, and under twelve years of age, can and may partake with the mind and will of the "bread of life," put on Christ's "spirit and life," the spiritual meaning of to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," and have "everlasting life," be "raised up in the last day," without Catholic Communion. All they need to do is to come or go to Christ, and believe and live as He would have them to live.

But now it may be asked, What does it mean to go to Christ, or what is the Gospel, if it does not mean and include the Catholic literal interpretation of the precept to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," in a literal or after a carnal man-

ner, a mouth-eating act? Well, the coming or going to Christ for the "bread of life," the Gospel, means having, what Christ taught, Faith, Repentance, Amendment, Forgiveness, Justice, Righteousness and Hope; that is faith that God is (Heb. 11:6) and will forgive repentant sinners who return to Him, forsake their sins—amend their lives—and that there is the hope of a blissful everlasting life beyond the grave for those who here hunger and thirst for it, and who live and act so as to obtain it. Such being the Gospel, the "bread of life," then can one have and exercise faith, repentance, amendment, justice and hope by putting or taking some certain thing into the mouth, literally eating and swallowing it so that it goes into the stomach and is destroyed and digested by its "natural heat?" No; but those spiritual activities must and can come only through the mind and will, a mental act, not a mouth-eating act.

That, then, is what the Gospel is, the "bread of life," the "living bread which came down from heaven" (John 6:41), as did all the other divinely inspired teachings of the Bible "come down from heaven," from God, if it does not include the Catholic literal interpretation of John 6:53-58. Spiritual food can no more be materialized and be eaten with the mouth than faith, repentance, amendment, hope, etc., can. There is nothing more material or literal about the "bread of life" than there is about the following, which one certainly cannot literally eat and drink with the mouth:

They that *eat* me (wisdom), shall yet hunger, and they that *drink* me, shall yet thirst (Ecclus. 24:29).

Thy words were found, and I did eat them (Jer. 15:15, 16),

Compare that with eating the "bread of life" and see if one can be made any more or less literal than the other.

O taste, and see that the Lord is sweet (Ps. 33:9).
How sweet are thy words to my palate: more than honey to my mouth (Ps. 118:103).

Did that mean the literal tasting with the mouth, of the Lord in order to see if He literally tasted sweet, as honey, for instance, when the Israelites had no Real Presence of the Lord in eatable material elements to eat or taste by literally eating and drinking them with the mouth? And did it mean tasting words with the "palate" as one tastes honey? Hardly. And are words fed to the palate as honey is? No. Why, then, believe the "bread of life" is to be eaten like Manna was in the desert, because Christ contrasted the "bread of life" with Manna?

Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation (Isa. 12:3).

Is that to be taken literally? If so, then where are the holes in the ground that are "the wells of salvation" out of which one may draw water, which no doubt also ought to be of natural water appearance?

They that depart from thee, shall be written in the earth, because they have forsaken the Lord, the vein (fountain) of living waters (Jer. 17:13).

Did they have Sacraments in the days of Jeremiah, being that the Church believes her Sacraments now are the fountains of "living waters" (Catholic News, April 30, 1904, p. 8), and especially the Eucharist, as may be seen by the following?

Why will men starve with spiritual hunger when they have within their grasp the bread of life? Why will they be parched with thirst when they can be refreshed at the fountain of living waters? Why shiver with cold when they can be warmed at the fire of divine love?—Cardinal Gibbons on Daily Communion (Messenger of the Sacred Heart, June, 1909, p. 323)?

To continue:

To him that thirsteth, I will give of the fountain of the water of life, freely (Apoc. 21:6; see also 22:17).

As the "water of life," and "living water," mean one and the same thing, then did Christ mean He would give, freely, "to him that thirsteth," Communion, to quench his parching thirst, or did He mean Baptism? For a Catholic writer, in a personal letter to me, had the following to say about "living water":

As regards the woman of Samaria, if you will again read previous verses you will observe that Our Lord was speaking of baptism and it requires no stretch of the imagination to see what was meant by "living water". Nor was Nicodemus concerned with mental water, but real water.

By what we have seen, it is certain Christ did not mean either Communion or Baptism, that He would give freely "to him that thirsteth." But what He would give may be seen by John 7: 39, where it says:

Now this He said of the spirit which they should receive, who believed in Him.

Now, if the "bread of life" is of literal or natural bread appearance, then where is the literal or natural water appearance "fountain of water," "well of salvation," that contains the "water of life", "living water", so that one may draw it out as the woman of Samaria drew natural water out of Jacob's well,

and that one may literally drink it, "freely," being that the Church calls the Eucharist the "bread of life"—

Because it is made *from* bread, as man is called dust, because he was made out of dust—Gen. 3:19 (Clearing the Way, Rev. Xavier Sutton, p. 88)?

I repeat, where is that literal water appearance "fountain of water" that contains the "water of life?" There ought to be such a fountain and "living water" in it, if the "bread of life," the "living bread", is called so, "because it is made from bread." Is that not so?

The "fountains of living water" and the "water of life" mean one and the same thing; that is, divine truths, graces, etc., in other words, the "living bread which came down from heaven." And the "bread of life," the "living bread," also mean the same. The "bread of life" and the "water of life," and the "living bread" and the "living water" are but alternate expressions and mean one and the same thing. That such is the case is further proven by the following:

Jesus answered and said to her: If thou didst know the gift of God, and who he is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou perhaps wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water (John 4:10).

And on the last, and great day of the festival, Jesus stood and cried, saying: If any man thirst, let him come to me, and drink. He that (drinketh me? No, but) believeth in me, as the Scripture saith, Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters (John 7:37,38).

The Church says, as we saw, that her Sacraments are the "fountains of living waters." If that is so, then do the Sacraments, the "rivers of living waters," flow "out of the belly," and would Christ have given

the Samaritan woman, had she asked for "living water," and those who should have come to Him on the "great day of the festival," to eat and drink supposed transubstantiated bread and wine, when as yet He had not instituted any Sacraments? And would He have made them go to confession to Him in order to "prove" themselves worthy to eat His flesh and drink His blood? Hardly. Yet He used very much the same kind of language in those two instances that He used in John 6: 35. The "bread of life," then, is not literal bread of natural bread appearance, is it? No; and no more so than "living water" is of the form and appearance of natural water. The Church says further:

> Under the species of bread: for remarks Bourdaloue, "All foods not being as common, Christ selected that which was most so, which we can least dispense with, which nourishes rich and poor; the bread of every day: and it is thus He desires to give Himself to us every day" (Sentinel of the Blessed Sacrament, August, 1908, p. 252).

If, then, Christ selected bread, because the most common of foods, for the species under which to receive the "bread of life," then why did He not also select water, which is in reality more of a daily necescity and nourishment than bread, and which is even more common than bread, for the species under which to receive and drink the "living water" if one "thirsteth" for it? It is because He did not mean anything of water form and appearance when He spoke of "living water," "water of life." And it was the same when He spoke of the "bread of life," "living bread;" He did not mean anything of bread form and appearance, and he did not select bread, because most common of foods as the species under which He would give us the "bread of life," which "He desires to give

to us every day" in Catholic Communion, as the Church believes. He had no bread before Him when he spoke of the "bread of life," or said: "I am the bread of life." And at the institution of the Lord's Supper He did not say, as He took bread in His hands and blessed it:

> This is the living bread, or bread of life, that I promised, in the synagogue, in Capharnaum, I would one day give for the life of the world; that if any man eat of it, he may not die; that he might have everlasting life: and that I might raise him up in the last day.

And the burden of His discourse with His disciples at the institution of the Lord's Supper was not about any "bread of life," but about His betrayal by Judas, and a simple memorial by which to specially remember Him, which memorial, or Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Mass, which the Church has made out of the plain and simple Lord's Supper, has by her been so "mystified" and surrounded with pomp, rites and ceremonies that one having only a Bible knowledge and description of the Lord's Supper cannot possibly recognize it as such. Yet he would easily recognize it as the Lord's Supper did he witness for the first time a Protestant Communion service. But be that as it may, when Christ spoke of the "bread of life" he had no bread before Him, yet there was natural water in Jacob's well before Him when He spoke to the Samaritan woman about "living water," and He even contrasted the one with the other, which He would give to drink, so that one "shall not thirst for ever," "become in Him a fountain of water, springing up into life everlasting." And yet the Church takes the "bread of life" in the literal sense, and the "living water" in a

"metaphorical" sense. By what rule of logic and interpretation can that be done?

In speaking of John 4: 14, which reads as follows:

> But the water that I will give him (to drink, ver. 13), shall become in him a fountain of water springing up into everlasting life,

the Church says:

> This language is plainly metaphorical (The Path Which Led a Protestant Lawyer to The Catholic Church, Burnett, Rev. Jas. Sullivan, Ed., p. 294).

If, then, Christ did not mean a thing of water form and appearance, when He spoke of the "water that I will give him" (John 4: 14), and the drinking of it was not to be after the manner of literally drinking as one would drink natural water, as that out of Jacob's well, for instance, then by what process of reasoning and rule of interpretation can the following be made literal, and not likewise "metaphorical?"

> If any man (from twelve years old on up?) eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world (John 6: 52)?

And is the "life of the world" (John 6: 52) the same as "life everlasting" (John 4: 14)? If so, then why is the method of obtaining it after the literal manner of eating something with the mouth, when it is after a different manner, a "metaphorical" manner, in John 4: 13, 14, where Christ speaks of a water, "living water," as He speaks of a "living bread" (John 6: 51), and of drinking it, which the Samaritan woman believed she was to drink in as literal a manner as she drank the natural water from Jacob's well? Here He contrasted the "living water" and the drinking of it and its effects with the natural water from Jacob's

well, and the Church says His "language is plainly metaphorical," while His contrasting the "bread of life" with manna (John 6:49), the Church takes not in a "metaphorical," but not in the literal, sense. Why taking this contrasting by Christ in plain language in one case in a "metaphorical" sense, and in the other in a literal sense, when the taking of it in the literal sense leads, as we saw, to a lot of absurdities, difficulties and contradictions, and, I might add, pagan idolatry and superstition, and to an unscriptural way of having the continuous presence of Christ? There is no way to account for it, or no other reason for it, except that the Church fell into error in her interpretation of John 6:52-64; just as the Jewish Church did with the interpretations of the prophecies pertaining to "the promised Son of David," by taking them in the literal sense.

Again, if, as the Catholic writer in a letter to me claims, Christ spoke of baptism when He spoke of "living water" (John 4:10), then it would have to be drunk like natural water is drunk, if to eat the "bread of life" one must eat after the manner the manna was eaten. For He said:

> Whosoever drinketh of this water (from Jacob's well), shall thirst again; but he that shall DRINK of the water that I will give him, shall not thirst for ever (John 4:13).

If by that Christ meant baptism, but by the drinking of the "living water" He did not mean that one should literally drink anything of the appearance of water, but should apply literal water on the external body, then by what process of reasoning and rule of interpretation can the Church claim the eating and drinking spoken of in John 6:54, 55, is a literal bread

and wine eating and drinking operation with the mouth? And what about the drinking in John 7:37 and in the latter part of Apoc. 22:17, if the "water of life," "living water," means baptismal water? Was one to receive baptism frequently, because it says to "take the water of life, freely;" that is, at will and whenever one wants to? But if the "water of life" is not of natural water form and substance, then by what process of reasoning or rule of interpretation can the Church claim or make the "bread of life"—where is the wine of life?"—of bread form and substance?

"Shall not thirst forever," then, is not a literal thirst, according to the one who wrote me. Yet in order never to thirst again Christ told the woman she must *drink* "living water," and He said it in such a way, by comparison with drinking natural water from Jacob's well, that she could not help but believe it was to be drunk in the same way that she drank the water from Jacob's well. And if the "living water" Christ spoke of meant baptismal waters, and when He said she must drink of it, He did not mean she must literally drink it, then why should the eating of the "bread of life" be after a literal or carnal manner, because He compared its eating with the eating of the manna by the fathers in the desert? It should not be. The Church has simply erred in the matter.

Again, if Christ spoke of baptism to the woman of Samaria then He told her of a different way of receiving it from that which He told Nicodemus. For He said to her:

> He that shall DRINK of the water that I will give him, shall not thirst for ever. (Like John 6:35, where the same result is to be obtained by believing.)

To Nicodemus He said:

> Unless a man be born again of water (That is, come out of an envelopment of water; not drink it) and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.

Those are two quite different and opposite methods. In one method man is to put the water into himself by drinking it, and in the other he is to put it on the external body. Now, which method is the correct one? For if to drink in John 6:54 means to drink something literally with the mouth, then it must also mean a literal drinking with the mouth in John 4:13; for Christ voiced both of them. Which method, then, is the proper one for the reception of baptism if Christ spoke about baptism to the woman of Samaria when He mentioned "living water" to her?

The whole difficulty and contradictions vanish when we reduce the operations in all these cases to a mental one of the mind and will. That is the "key" to the plain understanding of the meaning of Christ's words when He spoke of drinking "living water," "water of life," eating the "bread of life," and eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Son of Man—meaning spiritually to put on His "spirit and life" by a mental operation of the mind and will. For all the operations of the Spirit are effected through the mind and will "by the hearing of faith" (Gal. 3:2), not "by works of the law," that is, visible material rites performed on the physical body. For the soul must be reached through the mind.

When I learned that the soul must be reached, fed and nourished spiritually through the mind, the receiving and assimilating organ of the soul, and not by putting certain things into the mouth and eating

them as one does natural food for the body, then the error of the Church became as clear as day to me, when she believes and teaches that we must eat the supposed body of Christ if we want Him to enter our hearts, souls, and nourish and strengthen them, or that we must "frequent the Eucharistic table" if we want to "put on Christ," as Pope Leo XIII. taught.

That the heart and soul must be reached through the mind, the opening to them, is further proven by the fact that evil thoughts enter them not through the mouth, but through the mind. And good thoughts enter in the same way. It is also said that:

An idle mind is the devil's workshop.

But how can the mind be the devil's workshop unless he gets into it? And how does he get into it? Does he enter it through the medium of something in material form that is eaten with the mouth? No; but by the mental act of the mind and will of the one who lets him in when he knocks, presses for admission, as Christ does (Apoc. 3:20). And it is the same with Christ reaching, entering the mind, heart and soul of man. All that one needs to do is to have the desire, mind and will to have Christ, that is, His Spirit, enter one's heart, soul, and He will enter without the medium of a material channel, the "frequentation of the Eucharistic table." Even in Catholic Communion He must go from the mouth or from the stomach to one's heart, soul, without the medium of the Eucharist. For the Eucharist is received in the mouth, goes down the throat and into the stomach. So, then, why not receive Christ through the mind by faith, the scriptural way, so that He may dwell continuously with one till one "chased Him away by sin and enthroned Satan in His place?" And does

one "enthrone Satan in His place" by receiving Satan in some material thing through the mouth? No. And can not Christ go or enter where Satan can without a material channel, the reception of something in the mouth? Think of that question again.

If, then, the heart, soul, must be reached through the mind, as the devil does, is not the Church, though supposed to be infallible, and the first and oldest Church after the Jewish Church, greatly in error for believing and teaching that the heart, soul, can be reached, fed and nourished, or that Christ can be put on, by putting a certain thing or things into the mouth, that is, "by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table?" Yes.

Again, when one goes to Communion to receive Christ into one's heart, soul, and prays to Him there, and His presence ceases as soon as the "natural heat" has destroyed the "species," and one wants to continue praying to Him after His presence has ceased in one's heart, as, for instance, an hour or so after Communion, when the "species" certainly have "ceased because of digestion," then where does one or should one contemplate Christ as having gone to or being? And what becomes of the Christ ego that was present in the species in one before they "ceased because of digestion?" Does it go to the tabernacle to be merged into one ego with the Christ ego supposed to be present in the Eucharist there? If so, then would it not add to His quantity? Or, where does it go after it leaves one's heart, soul? Or, is it annihilated as the truth or wisdom in a book would be that was destroyed by the "natural heat" of the fire that destroyed it? For the Christ ego in each Eucharist is supposed to be a conscious entity, while the truth or

wisdom in a book is not. In view of that, then, what becomes of the Christ ego received into one's heart by Communion, after the species have "ceased because of digestion," and it requires the medium of the Eucharist to get Christ into one's heart, soul, and to hold Him there? Is it not evident that the heart, soul, must be reached through the mind and that that is the way to receive Christ?

CHAPTER V.

The Church has fallen into as great an error with regard as to how Christ is received and put on as the Galatians were, who would receive the Spirit "by the works of the law" (Gal. 3:2), that is, a carnal or bodily operation instead of a mental one through the mind, "by the hearing of faith" (Ibid.) And one might also exclaim here, as St. Paul did with regard to the Galatians (Gal. 3:1-3):

O senseless Catholic Church, who hath bewitched you that you should now believe the Spirit of Christ is received by the flesh, that is, Communion of and through the mouth? Are you so foolish, that whereas the Spirit is received "by the hearing of faith", you would now have your members receive it "by the flesh"—mouth-eating Communion?

Christ also said:

Behold, I stand at the gate, and knock. If any man shall hear my voice, and open to me the door, I will come to him, and will sup with him, and he with me (Apoc. 3:20).

To "open the door" to Christ does that mean to open the mouth, the opening to the stomach, to receive Communion, the supposed "bread of life," or does it mean to open the mind, the opening to the heart and soul? It is manifestly the latter, is it not? Yes.

In view, then, of all that we have noted, the "bread of life" is not a thing of material form, containing the supposed literal flesh and blood of Christ, which we must literally eat and drink if we want everlasting

life, as the Church teaches, and as understood by the Jews, who said:

> How can this man give us his flesh to eat? (John 6:53).

Christ could easily have done that, just as easily as we are given other flesh to eat, if that had been what He meant. But He did not mean that; for He explained to His disciples later what He meant by that, and that was to put on, scripturally eat and drink, His "spirit and life" (John 6:64). For in Scripture when it speaks of eating and drinking anything outside of natural food and drink for the body, it means to imbibe and assimilate it with the mind and will, not by a mouth-eating and drinking operation.

Because the Jews, and some of His disciples, took His sayings literally in the matter in question, the Church cites that as supporting her course for taking the sayings of Christ literally. But that is no criterion for taking them so; for the Jews also have always taken literally, and do so yet, the prophecies pertaining to their promised Messiah. Now, if the Jews were in error for taking in the literal acceptation those prophecies and have, therefore, not, and apparently will not, accept Christ as their promised Messiah, because He has not fulfilled the prophecies according to their literal acceptation of them, then are they to be taken as a criterion for the literal acceptation or understanding of the terms, the "bread of life," and for the literal eating and drinking of the supposed flesh and blood of Christ, because they so understood them and said: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Hardly.

The Jews, on the occasion in question, as much misunderstood Christ as did the Samaritan woman at

Jacob's well, when He told her about "living water," which if one drank of it one "shall not thirst for ever" (John 4:13), just as the one who believed in the "bread of life" "shall never thirst" (John 4:35). She then said to Him:

> Sir, thou hast nothing wherein to draw, and the well is deep; from whence then hast thou living water (John 4:11)?

just as the Jews said, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" and as Nicodemus said, "How can these things be done?" (John 3:9.) After Christ told her the difference in the effects between using or drinking natural water and "living water," she said to him:

> Sir, give me this water, that I may not thirst, nor come hither to draw (John 4:15),

just as the Jews said:

> Lord, give us always this bread (John 6:34).

That they said to Christ after He told them what the effects would be of the "bread of God" (John 6:33), the "bread of life" (verse 35), the "living bread" (verse 51), which they later believed was His real, carnal flesh that He would give "for the life of the world" (verse 52), and which they believed they were to eat literally as the Samaritan woman believed she was to literally drink "living water."

By the fact that the effect produced by the use of "living water" would be to make one "not thirst for ever" (John 4:13), just as that of the "bread of life" would make one also to "never thirst" (John 6:35). or, one "may not die" (verse 50), shows that the "living water," the "bread of life," the "living bread which came down from heaven" (verse 51), and the

"my flesh, for the life of the world" (verse 52), are all one and the same thing. That the one is no more material in form and appearance than the other; that the one is no more of the appearance of natural bread than the other is of the appearance of natural water. Such being the case, then, there is no more a Real Presence of Christ in the "bread of life," as the Church claims there is, and which we must literally eat or drink in order that we may not die," may "live for ever," have "everlasting life" and be raised "up in the last day," than there is a Real Presence in the "living water," "water of life." And one is just as much of a "metaphorical" expression as the other.

In view of all that, then, is it not plainly to be seen that the Church greatly erred in interpreting in the literal sense the sixth chapter of St. John, and thereby deduced the doctrine of the Real Presence from it, because the Jews apparently understood Christ as speaking in the literal sense and said: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"—"From whence then hast thou living water?" (John 4: 11)—"How can these things be done?" (John 3: 9.) And Nicodemus, too, was "a master (teacher) in Israel" (John 3: 10), and of an intelligence far superior to that of the Jews on the occasion of John 6: 24-60. Yes; it may easily be seen that she erred in her interpretation.

The Church, in her Bible, in annotations to John 6: 36 and 41, says:

Ver. 36. You demand this bread; behold it is before you, and yet you eat it not. I am the bread; to believe in me is to eat me. You see me, but you do not believe in me. S. Austin—It is to this place that those words of S. Austin are to be referred: "Why do you prepare your teeth and belly? believe in me, and you have eaten me". Words which do not destroy

the real presence, of which he is not speaking in this verse. Maldon. 35.

Ver. 41. *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven.* These Jews did not believe that Christ was the true and eternal Son of God, who came from heaven, and was *made flesh*, was made man. He speaks of this faith in him, when he calls himself *the living bread,* the mystical bread of life, that came to give life everlasting to all true and faithful believers. In this sense S. Augustin said, (Trac. 25, p. 489,) *Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and belly? Only believe, and thou hast eaten*: but afterwards he passeth to his sacramental and real presence in the holy sacrament. Wi.

But anyone who will closely examine the sixth chapter of St. John, from verses 31 to 59, will easily see that if to "believe in Christ is to eat Him," when speaking as in verses 35 and 40, then it means the same thing when speaking as in verses 50, 52, 55, 58 and 59. For by complying with the precepts of the former, one "may have life everlasting, and I will raise him up in the last day" (verse 40), just as one complying with the precepts of the latter, "hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day" (verse 55). There is no difference, then, is there, between the effects of verses 40 and 44, where, as we saw, one "has eaten" Christ by believing in Him, and verse 55, where He is supposed to have spoken after He, in His discourse, had passed "to His sacramental and real presence in the holy sacrament"? No. Nor is there any difference in the effects produced between verse 33, where the "bread of God," the "bread of life" (verse 35), "giveth life to the world" (verse 33), and verse 52, where Christ will give His flesh, "for the life of the world." And if in verses 34 to 41 "to believe in Christ is to eat Him," or if to "only believe, and thou hast eaten" Him, then it also means to believe

in Him where He says: "He that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me" (verse 58), and does then not mean that we must literally eat Him in Communion. And "he that eateth this bread shall live for ever" (verse 59), which is supposed to be after He had in His discourse passed "to His sacramental and real presence in the holy sacrament," means the same thing as "he that believeth in Me, hath everlasting life" (verse 47), which He is supposed to have spoken before that discourse on the Real Presence, does it not? Yes. For the Church believes Christ passed from "metaphorical," or figurative, speech to literal speech, and to "another topic at about the forty-eighth verse" (The Path Which Led, etc., Rev. Sullivan, Ed., p. 276). But it is not quite easy to see a line of demarcation there, and that that going before the forty-eighth verse should be metaphorical speech and that that following it should be literal speech, the latter supposedly teaching the doctrine of the Real Presence and the literal mouth-eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ, which are supposed to be "in the holy sacrament." For it appears there is no more difference, in substance, between the meaning of that which goes before that supposed line of demarcation, and that which follows it, than there is betwixt the meaning of John 3: 3, 5, 6 and 8. And it seems the Jews misunderstood that which went before that line of demarcation as they did that which followed it, for they said, "Lord, give us always this bread" (verse 34), as they after that line said, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (verse 53.)

The sixth chapter of St. John, then, does not treat, as the Church claims, of the Real Presence, and the

literal eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ, does it?

By the forepart of the sixth chapter of St. John, which chapter the Church, and all Catholic writers, claim is "a treatise on the Blessed Sacrament, the Real Presence, etc." (The Gospel Plea for Christian Unity, Rev. James O'Donoghue, p. 42), it may be seen that the Jews also took in the literal sense the prophecies pertaining to their promised Messiah, as may be seen by the following:

> Now those men (Who the next day said: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?'), when they had seen what a miracle Jesus had done, said: This is of a truth the prophet, that is to come into the world. Jesus, therefore, when he knew that they would come to take him by force, and make him king, fled again into the mountain himself alone (John 6:14, 15).

Of the promised Messiah, "the prophet that is to come into the world," the following was foretold:

> Jehovah hath sworn unto David in truth; : : : of the fruit of thy loins I will set upon thy throne (Ps. 131:11; Acts 2:30).
>
> The government is upon his shoulder: . . . His empire shall be multiplied. . . . he shall sit upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom: to establish it. . . . And I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder, . . . and he shall reign in the house of Jacob forever (Isa. 9:6, 7; 22:22; Luke 1:32).

As the throne, king, kingdom and "house of Jacob," of which the prophecies spoke, were not earthly, but spiritual, a new church in which Christ would by His Spirit reign in the hearts of the people as King, then did the Jews not err in taking the prophecies in the literal sense, when they would make Christ an earthly king, set Him upon the literal earthly "throne of

David, His father" (Luke 1:32), which throne had at one time been in Jerusalem, even though it was a theocratic throne? Yes. For the "kingdom" could not have meant to the Jews their Church. For they had not lost their Church, though it might have been "fallen down" (Acts 15:16), have become corrupt, as the Reformers of the sixteenth century claimed the Roman Catholic Church had become, so that "the prophet that is to come into the world," should "establish it," rebuild it. In fact, they had been and were taught to believe the covenants, ordinances, etc., of their Church were for "everlasting," "for ever," "perpetual" (Gen. 17:3; Lev. 3:17; 6:13; 16:34, etc.), and their Church was to be rebuilt and be as it "was of old" (Amos 9:11; Acts 15:16-18), so that the thought of a new Church, in which the promised Messiah was to reign, was foreign to them, and they could not, therefore, have understood the "kingdom" to be any other kingdom than David's earthly kingdom that had been lost to the Romans, which the "Prince of Peace" (Isaiah 9:6) was to "establish," rebuild and govern. Now, as Christ knew they were holding wrong views about the kind of kingship that of the promised Messiah's would be, then would not that have been the time and place to have explained to them that the prophecies were not to be taken in the literal sense, unless the prophecies "were calculated to deceive the greater number of" the Jews, as the Church claims would be the case with the people of the present and all times were Christ's words of John 6:54, 55 and Luke 22:19, 20 not to be understood in the literal sense, as may be seen by the following?

And when the Jews objected to this doctrine (of John vi. 54, 55) as repugnant, far from telling them it was figurative language, He repeated His statement and allowed them to depart; more than this, He allowed some of His disciples to depart because they, too, understood Him to speak of His living body as being in truth meat for them; and far from disabusing their minds of the Catholic literal interpretation of His words, which it would seem He would have been bound in honesty to do were it false, He turned to His Apostles and would have them too to go away: "Will ye also go away?" if they did not accept this interpretation (The Gospel Plea for Christian Unity, Rev. Martin O'Donoghue, pp. 42, 43).

That was no time (Luke 22:19, 20) to speak in misleading figures of speech, for our Lord was making His Last Testament, and instituting a sacrament and a sacrifice which would last until His second coming (Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 26). Would He, the Infinite Wisdom, and the Lover of Souls, use words which were calculated to deceive the greater number of His people for all time, and lead them into the idolatry He came expressly to abolish (The Question-Box Answers, Rev. Bertrand L. Conway, pp. 430, 431)?

As the Jews understood in the literal sense the prophecies pertaining to "the prophet that is to come into the world," who was to "abide for ever" (John 12:34), the kingdom and king (John 19:15), then was Christ not "bound in honesty" to tell them that the prophecies did not mean an earthly kingdom and king, but meant a spiritual kingdom, a church, which He would spiritually "abide with for ever" and govern, and that He would by His Spirit reign in the hearts and lives of the people as King, as now understood by the Christian churches, unless the prophecies "were calculated to deceive the greater number of" the Jews. Yes. Yet He did not so explain the prophecies to them and instead He "fled again into the mountain Himself alone."

I will make a digression here before we get too far away from the last two quotations. In the first it says: "His disciples understood Him to speak of His living body as being in truth meat for them." Yes; but it was not to be understood in the literal sense as a "meat" that was to be eaten with the mouth, but as a living example to them of "spirit and life," deeds and good works; just as the "meat to eat" (John 4:32), which Christ told His disciples He had to eat, was to "do the will of Him that sent Him" (John 4:34). Here Christ explained to them what He meant by "meat," just as He in John 6:64 explained to them what He meant by John 6:54-58, and that it meant "spirit and life," which were to be used in the same way that Christ "eat" the "meat" His Father gave Him to eat. But as most of His disciples, being Jews, and being, therefore, imbued with a sensuous and materialistic view of religion and the prophecies, they took a literal view of the discourse, therefore, and they did not grasp the spiritual meaning very readily of His words, and did not apparently understand what He meant by "spirit and life," they then "went back; and walked no more with Him" (John 6:67).

The unfoldment of the spiritual meaning of words in Scripture is a slow process—which was my experience—where the consciousness has long and always been impressed and imbued with the literal meaning of Scripture words, which was the case with most of Christ's disciples and the Jews, who looked upon the words of the prophecies pertaining to the "promised Son of David" as to be taken in the literal sense. Therefore, some of His disciples looked upon the words of Christ as to be taken in the literal sense, as they had upon the prophecies, and as the spiritual

unfoldment of the meaning of the words did not come to them at the time, they looked upon them as "hard," and who can hear it?"—accept it, and they then "walked no more with Him. Had they looked upon "His living body" as an example for them, instead of looking upon it as to be eaten as the "meat bought in the shambles," they would not have thought it a "hard" saying, and would then not have left Him.

Now, for the last quotation. In it is this: "Would He, the Infinite Wisdom . . . lead them into the idolatry He came expressly to abolish?" Was it Jewish Church "idolatry He came expressly to abolish?" If so, and it must be, for He was addressing Jews "in the synagogue" (John 6:60), then how could the Jewish Church fall into idolatry if she was up to that time the true Church of God, was infallible and was preserved from erring and falling into idolatry, as the Church claims she was, as we shall see later, and as the Church claims is the case with herself, because she is supposed to be the "only and true Church of Christ?" If, then, the Jewish Church could in time fall into idolatry, then why could not the Roman Catholic Church likewise in time fall into idolatry with regard to the adoration and worship of the Eucharist as "a God"?

Now, back to where the digression was made. Neither did Christ set the Jews aright on the matter of His kingship when they accused Him before Pilate for claiming or admitting He was the "king of the Jews," as may be seen by Matt. 27:11; Mark 15:2; Luke 23:2, 3, and John 19:12, 15. Now, why did He not set them aright or "disabuse their minds" of their false views? It was no doubt because He knew it would be useless to do so, had He tried to tell them

that the prophecies did not have a literal meaning, but had a spiritual meaning, and that He would be a spiritual King and reign by His Spirit in the hearts and lives of the people. For had he attempted to so explain the prophecies to them, they, in their excited imaginations and material and sensuous views of religion, might in the end have said, as Nicodemus, "a master in Israel," did: "How can these things be done?" Or they might have ridiculed Him and said, as one did of me, that He was a "deluded religiomaniac who expects to be made the prophet of a new revelation." Those were probably the reasons why Christ did not attempt to set the Jews aright at the time on the matter in question. It is true that He did a number of times say His "Kingdom is not of this world," but it was too late then, they believing He was saying that only after He saw death staring Him in the face. But even then He did not say His kingdom meant a church; for if He had it would have made matters no better. For then the Jews would have felt, or might have felt, that their High Priest's office would be endangered and lost, which they might have regarded as a greater calamity than the losing of their identity as a nation; just as Catholics would regard the loss of the office of the Pope as a greater calamity than the loss of identity of any earthly nation, or the loss of their dearest personal treasures on earth.

That the Jews in general misunderstood the prophecies is not to be wondered at; for even the disciples of Christ misunderstood them, as well as the mission and sayings of Christ. And it was not till after they received on Pentecost the "Paraclete," the "Spirit of truth," that they received the revelation of the true meaning of the prophecies and the sayings

of Christ. Even after the Resurrection and just before the Ascension of Christ, and after they had been with Him during most of the time of His missionary labors, they had a wrong understanding of the mission of Christ on earth. For they said to Him just before the Ascension:

> Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel (Acts 1:6)?

Did Christ then and there "disabuse their minds" of their false views? No. No doubt they thought Christ would "restore again the kingdom to Israel," an earthly kingdom, that which the Israelites had lost to the Romans, then dispose it to them after dividing it into twelve provinces, building thrones and placing them upon the "thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Luke 22:29, 30), they no doubt having taken in the literal sense the prophecies and the sayings of Christ in Luke 22:29, 30. Even Catholic writers of authority at this day do not interpret alike Luke 22: 29, 30, as may be seen by the following:

> (Luke xxii. 29, 30). (1) What kingdom is meant? (2) What table, at which they were to eat? (3) Where are the thrones upon which they are to sit? (4) Who are meant by the twelve tribes of Israel?
>
> Answers. 1. By the kingdom is meant the eternal glory and happiness of Heaven, of which Christ made them "co-heirs" with Himself. 2. By eating and drinking at his table is meant the everlasting union with Himself, and the possession of His love which would be theirs in Heaven. 3. By the throne of judgment is meant, that in the General Judgment the Apostles will assist as assessors, or "co-judges" with Christ. 4. Israel here stands for mankind (Truth, October, 1907, p. 158).
>
> He is seated with His chosen at the Last Supper. How momentous His words, as St. Luke has preserved them for us (xxii. 29-32): "I appoint unto you a kingdom", He says "as

My father hath appointed unto Me: that you may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom, and may sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel". This "kingdom" is, evidently, the Church here on earth; for the eating and drinking at His table means the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice just instituted. The "twelve tribes of Israel" are the *new* Israel, to be created by the preaching of the Gospel through the world. And *they* (the Apostles) are to reign over this Israel *in their successors,* the bishops of the Church (A Short Cut to The True Church, Rev. Edmund Hill, C. P., pp. 40, 41).

Those two authorities do not agree by a good deal, do they? No. Yet the Church says:

The Catholic Church alone, of all the Christian communions, claims to exercise the prerogative of infallibility in her teaching. Her ministers always speak from the pulpit as having authority, and the faithful receive with implicit confidence what the Church teaches, without once questioning her veracity (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, pp. 62, 63).

Non-agreements in the teachings of "authorized ministers" certainly does not show a very great "infallibility in her teaching," does it? No. And it seems it would be grounds for "once questioning her veracity," if Catholics had the courage to dare to question it.

Luke 22:29, 30 was figurative or parabolic speech, and it was spoken at the time Christ instituted the memorial of His special remembrance, the Lord's Supper. Yet the Church says:

On that night Jesus would not speak figuratively; in fact, He had told the Apostles a short time before, that He would never more speak to them in parables. Would the Great Teacher deceive us in His last will and testament concerning a matter of such tremendous importance? What a vast difference between being actually present in the Eucharist and not being present (Truth, April 1908, p. 3).

But yet on that very same night He did speak figuratively to the Apostles. And by Acts 1:6 it may be seen that they must have understood Him literally when He spoke as in Luke 22:29, 30. Now, did the Great Teacher deceive them, because he told them "a short time before that He would never more speak in parables," figuratively, which He spoke after He had instituted the Lord's Supper?

The Church says further:

As the Church understands it, the Blessed Eucharist was promised in the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel, leaving the mere manner in which it was to be given, to be explained by the institution of the sacrament (The Path Which Led a Protestant Lawyer to The Catholic Church, Burnett, Rev. Sullivan, Ed., p. 310).

At the institution of the Lord's Supper Christ did not say: "This is that flesh and blood I promised, in the synagogue, in Capharnaum, to give for the life of the world." But the burden of His discourse or conversation He had with His disciples at the time was His betrayal by Judas. Now, if He was going to institute a sacrament of such "tremendous importance" as the Church has made of the Real Presence, the Eucharist, then would He be discoursing instead about His betrayal, immediately preceding and immediately after the institution of the Eucharist? Hardly. The Lord's Supper has no connection whatever with John 6th. That is even made plain by I Cor. 11:23-26. St. Paul said nothing about eating and drinking the Lord's Supper so that one may "have everlasting life, and be raised up in the last day." Neither did Christ say: "Do this, that you may have everlasting life, and I will raise you up in the last day." But He said: "Do this for a commemoration of Me." And

surely we can specially remember Him by eating and drinking blessed bread and wine after the manner they did at the Last Supper, and without eating and drinking Him, just as we can specially remember George Washington's birthday without eating and drinking him, by simply attending a birthday banquet given in his honor or memory.

But be that as it may, let us return to where we digressed again. Yet in all the time Christ was with His disciples He did not "disabuse their minds" of their wrong understanding of His mission on earth, which He no doubt knew they had about it. For He knew it would be useless to explain it to them, and that it would be revealed to them when they received the "Paraclete." And granting that they at the time of John 6:48-69 professed to have understood Christ in the literal sense, the true and spiritual meaning of His words was no doubt revealed to them in time after they had received the "Paraclete," "the Spirit of truth." And no doubt it was then revealed to them; for not one in his writings later stated that we must literally "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," in order to obtain everlasting life, but told them to receive the Spirit "by the hearing of faith," and exhorted the people to become "renewed in the spirit of their mind," that is, change from a spirit and life of worldliness and sin to a "spirit and life" of Godliness and virtue, and have, as we saw, Christ formed in them by having Him by His Spirit dwell in them not through the reception of anything material by the mouth, but "by faith."

Now, in view of all that, and the fact that the Jews at other times misunderstood Christ, then are we to take their understanding of John 6th, because

they took it in the literal sense and said: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" as a criterion for the supposed literalness of John 6th? Hardly.

Again, Christ in the same discourse, said:

> I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven; that if any man eat of it, he may not die. . . . If any man (this must include infants if John 3:5 does) eat this bread, he shall live forever (John 6:48-50, 52).

The negative of that must mean that "if any man eat *not* of this bread he shall *not* live forever," just as he that "is *not* born again shall *not* see the kingdom of God." Is not, then, Communion necessary for the salvation of infants and children if baptism is? But be that as it may, if the texts quoted are to be taken literally, then where or on what plane of existence are those to "live forever" who eat of the "bread of life," being that those who literally eat and drink the supposed literal flesh and blood of Christ die to appearances the same death the "fathers" did who "eat manna in the desert, and are dead?"

Were the Jews to understand that the souls of their fathers who died in the desert are wholly dead in soul as well as in body, dead forever, annihilated, so that they will *not* be "raised up in the last day?" Such would be the case if the "bread of life" is to be taken literally as bread of natural bread appearances, or else the "fathers" are all in hell, if "dead" in verse 49 does not mean total annihilation of consciousness, and means they will never be "raised up in the last day" to "see the kingdom of God," see "everlasting life." For those who eat and drink the supposed flesh and blood of Christ die to appearances the same physical

death that the "fathers" in the desert did, and we bury them in like manner. And not only the souls of the "fathers" but the soul of every one, from infants to children up to twelve years of age, who had not received Communion, would at death become totally annihilated and would not be "raised up in the last day," or else all of them would go to hell—see "death." Is that not so according to a strict literal interpretation of the texts in question? Yes. And according to the following they would go to hell, be perishable, if to be "perishable" means to go to hell:

> You shall never be saved, you shall never see eternal life. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life, and I shall raise him up in the last day". Christ here threatens with eternal damnation [Hell] those that refuse to eat His flesh and drink His blood (Transubstantiation, Rev. Father Damen, p. 7).
>
> The manna was an appropriate summing up of all the wonderful works which God had wrought in behalf of His chosen people, . . . yet it was after all but a perishable gift, and perishable remained they who partook of its vanishing sweetness; but this new manna [The "bread of life"] is not a perishable gift, and they that eat thereof shall not die forever (The Sacramental Life of The Church, Rev. Bernard J. Otten, S. J., p. 76).
>
> He compares this bread to the manna, which was given to the Israelites in the desert, and points out its superiority [As He did that of the "living water" over the natural water from Jacob's well], inasmuch as it imparts everlasting life, whereas those who ate of the manna are dead (Ibid., pp. 81, 82).

If the opposite of or absence of "everlasting life" is "eternal damnation," being "perishable," dead, then would not the Jews who "did eat manna in the desert, and are dead," be in hell, and would not then all those, including infants, who have died, or will yet

die, without having received Communion, be dead forever, be "perishable," be in hell or go there?

Besides, the Church says:

> According to our Saviour's promise the worthy communicant has received a pledge of salvation (Here quotes John 6:55). But, unfortunately, many soon forfeit this pledge by incurring again the guilt of mortal sin, but Jesus gladly renews His promise every time they come after contrite confession, to eat again of the bread that sows in the body the seeds of immortality and incorruption (The Messenger of The Sacred Heart, December, 1908, p. 717).

According to that, those who do not eat of "the bread that sows in the body the seeds of immortality and incorruption" will not have immortality and incorruption. And if so, then does that mean hell, "eternal damnation," or annihilation for such, including all Catholic children under twelve years of age, who die without ever receiving Communion, when they leave this plane of existence? And which of the two states, then, is the present one of the fathers who "did eat manna in the desert, and are dead," "perishable," if John 6:48-57 is to be taken in the literal sense. Will any of the Catholic writers I have just quoted dare go to a Jew and tell him his forefathers who "did eat manna in the desert, and are dead," are in hell "perishable"?

Again, how is the seed of immortality and incorruption sown if it leaves again "whole and entire" when the Host has "ceased because of digestion" or has been destroyed by "natural heat," causing then the presence of Christ, the seed of immortality, to cease living in one, pulling it up by the roots, as it were, or if Christ is ever eaten in Communion "without being consumed," without germinating in the body or

soul? Another difficulty when taken in the Catholic literal sense, is it not? Yes. John 6:48-57, then, can not be taken in the literal sense without involving the doctrine of the immortality and of the resurrection of any but those who have literally with the mouth "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," or else we would have to believe that all others are destined for hell, are in hell, "perishable"?

When the Church teaches as we saw from the last few quotations of Catholic writers she does, she seems to forget about her own children under twelve years of age, who die without ever receiving Communion. Is that not so?

Again, if the Eucharist, the "new manna, is not a perishable gift," then where does the newly-made imperishable flesh and blood of Christ-God go after the "species" have "ceased because of digestion?" Or how is it "new" if it is only a multiplication of the presence of the "glorified body of Christ in heaven?" And does one in Communion eat only the "presence" of Christ? Or why "frequent, and even daily" Communion, unless His "presence" is "chased away by sin?" For it seems that one present imperishable, omnipotent Christ-God with one would be sufficient for all purposes, if "one with God is a majority," and "if God be for us who can be against us?" The latter is a thing for Christian Science healers to bear in mind when they fail to heal anyone when they claim the reason they failed to heal it was because of "the adverse or antagonistic mental atmosphere that surrounded their patients." For if God be for Christian Science healing, then who can be against it so as to prevent healing? But be that as it may, there are a lot of difficulties, indeed, were there a Real Presence

in the Eucharist, it was "imperishable," and John 6: 48-58 should be taken in the literal sense.

Again, Christ said:

> He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him (John 6:57).

The Church says:

> It is easy to conceive of Christ as the lover of souls, taking one more step (institution of the Eucharist) to unite Himself personally with souls so dear to Him (Truth, April, 1908, p. 3).

To dwell in Christ and He in us at the same time can not be taken in a plain, literal and "obvious sense;" for we can not dwell within a house of four walls and at the same time that very house be within us. So with Christ and us. But we dwell in Him when we abide by or have the consciousness of His word, spirit and life and letting them influence, guide and govern our spirit, life and conduct. And He abides in us by His spirit when we live with a spirit and life that is as His was, and if we live according to His words. That is in accordance with "if you abide in me, and my words abide in you" (John 15:7), and, "as therefore you have (by faith) received Jesus Christ the Lord, walk ye in Him" (Col. 2:6)—that is, walk in the consciousness of His words and being guided and impelled by them and His spirit and life. It does not mean a literal walking in Him as one walks in a house. As the latter part of John 6:57, then, is not to be taken in the literal sense, so also then is the other part not to be taken in the strict literal sense, be regarded as a mouth-eating operation, but must be regarded in the spiritual sense, and as a precept of a mental act and will, by which one through

the mind puts on the "spirit and life" of Christ and "goes about doing good." That is the only way we can have the continuous abiding presence of Christ, have Him abide in us and we abide in Him. About a fifteen minutes' presence of Christ within us, by the Eucharist, monthly, quarterly or yearly, certainly can not be called as an abiding of Christ in us and we in Him. Such being the case, then is it not plainly evident that it is not through the reception of the Eucharist that we abide in Him and He in us, or that we "walk in Him?" Or that He unites Himself personally with souls?

Again, could it be called a uniting of "Himself personally with souls," if one communicates only monthly, quarterly or yearly and Christ takes His departure as soon as the Eucharist has "ceased because of digestion," which is at the most "about fifteen minutes after receiving?" Hardly.

Is, then, my understanding of how to have Christ abide in us continuously—until we "chased Him away by sin"—and we abide in Him, not the reasonable and comprehensible way, and in accordance with the texts already quoted, which speak of how to have the Spirit of Christ in us and how He is formed in us? There are no absurdities, no difficulties, no contradictions in that, are there? It is as plain as A B C after we once understand it. Such an understanding also makes it possible for children dying under twelve years of age, who are not permitted by the Church to receive Communion, "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," to have "everlasting life," be "raised up in the last day."

In view, then, of all that we have noted, we can not take John 6;48-64 in the literal sense, as the Church does, but we must take it in the spiritual

sense, or, as the Church would say, in a "metaphorical" or figurative sense, although the spiritual sense is not exactly the same as the metaphorical or figurative sense. But says the Church:

We cannot use figures of speech arbitrarily, and give them at will a new meaning, merely to meet the demands of controversy. "If I discover," argues Cardinal Wiseman, "that among the persons whom Jesus addressed, it (that is, the phrase *to eat flesh*) did bear a figurative signification besides its literal sense, then I must conclude that those persons could only select between that *established figurative sense*, and the literal import of the words" (p. 77). "Now I do assert that whether we examine (*a*) the phraseology of the Bible (Ps. xxvi. 2, Job xix. 22, Mich. iii. 3, Eccles. iv. 5, Gal. v. 15, (*b*) the ordinary language of the people who still inhabit the same country, and have inherited the same ideas (*i. e.*), the Arabs, or (*c*) in fine, the very language in which our Saviour addressed the Jews (Syro-Chaldaic), we shall find the expression to *eat the flesh* of a person signifying invariably, when used metaphorically, *to attempt to do him some serious injury, principally by calumny or false accusation.* Such therefore, was the only figurative meaning which the phrase could present to the audience at Capharnaum" (p. 80; *cf.* pp. 80-91). As no one would ever imagine that Christ could promise eternal life on condition of our calumniating Him, there remains but one possible sense of the words—the literal (The Question-Box Answers, Rev. B. L. Conway, pp. 421, 422).

In the phraseology of the Bible *to eat flesh* has three different meanings. One is to literally eat it as cannibals and animals do. Another way is to do one "some serious injury," by devouring, killing, destroying one. And another way, the third, is, like "to eat the book," to get a knowledge of one's spirit, character and life and assimilate them, which is done by the mind and will. We can likewise say there are three ways "to eat a book." One is to literally eat it as one would natural food. Another way is to do it

"some serious injury" by tearing it to pieces, destroying it, devouring it in fire. And another way, the third way, is to get a knowledge of its contents, imbibing and assimilating them. Now, it was the third way that Christ meant when He said to St. John:

> Take the book, and eat it up (Apoc. 10:9).

And it was also after the third way of "to eat flesh" that He meant when He said we should "eat" Him, "eat His flesh," eat His "spirit and life." If, then, we admit the third way, and that appears to be a reasonable, comprehensible and consistent way, then does there not remain another sense other than the figurative and the "one possible sense of the words—the literal?" And if so, then is not my understanding and interpretation of John 6th the correct one? If so, then is the Church not in error? Here is the point: if we admit the third way, a spiritual sense of interpretation of John 6th, then I am right and the Church is wrong. If we do *not* admit the third way, a spiritual interpretation of John 6th, then the Church *is* right and I am wrong. Think of that!

Again, the literal, or the "but one possible sense of the words" "eat My flesh," can not be and is not taken in its plain, literal and obvious sense after all by the Church, if the following is true:

> It must be remembered that our Saviour's body in the glorified state is spiritualized, possesses the qualities of a spirit (Truth, April, 1908, p. 6).

Now, if Christ's body is "spiritualized, possesses the qualities of a spirit," and "a spirit hath not flesh and bones" (Luke 24:39), then to "eat My flesh" is not in that literal sense after all as the Jews would

have had to understand it, if "to eat flesh" was not to be taken in that figurative sense as the Jews understood "to eat flesh" meant. For Christ was not as a "spirit," but as "the Son of Man," as human in appearance to the Jews as the Apostles were, when He said:

> He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up in the last day (John 6:55).

If it comes right to the point, then, of a plain, literal meaning of His words "to eat My flesh," such as one would understand of one who should say:

> I will not go where carnivorous animals or cannibals are that might eat my flesh and drink my blood, could they get at me,

it is not strictly literal after all, but after a partly figurative manner, after the manner of faith, to eat the supposed flesh of Christ when receiving Catholic Communion, "consuming" Christ, "feeding upon His blessed body," so that, then, His blood "flows in our veins as the blood of God." And it makes it a case of "now you do, and now you do not" eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ. Is that not so? Christ's words, then, are not to be taken in either a Syro-Chaldaic figurative sense, or in a plain, literal and "obvious sense," the only other "one possible sense" than the figurative, are they? No; for there is a third sense, a sense besides the figurative and the literal, which may be called the spiritual sense.

In view, then, of what we have seen, the words "I am the bread of life," "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," etc., can not be taken literally, even though the "Syro-Chaldaic Jews," to whom Christ spoke, may have understood them literally, and notwithstanding what Cardinal Wiseman said to the contrary. And

the words "I am the bread of life," then, are to be taken no more literally than the following:

I am the light of the world; I am the door; I am the vine (John 8:12; 10:9 and 15:5).

Each and all four of the terms are to be understood not literally, but, in terms other than spiritual, in the figurative or "metaphorical." For, if otherwise, then see the great difficulties, contradictions and absurdities encountered in connection with taking the "bread of life" in the literal sense and believing there is a Real Presence of Christ in it, and which have already been noted. "The bread of life," then, does not mean that it is the flesh and blood of Christ. It means His gospel and life; just as His gospel and life make Him "the light of the world;" or His gospel and life make Him the "door;" or His gospel and life make Him "the vine." Is that not so? Yes.

All four of the texts, then, mean practically one and the same thing and each one is "metaphorical," or figurative, and not one, "I am the bread of life," literal or of bread appearance and the other three, including "the water of life," "living water," "metaphorical," as the Church has interpreted them.

As the "bread of life," then, is not of material or bread form that can be eaten with the mouth, we may rest fully assured that to "eat this bread" (John 6:59) then no more means to literally eat something of bread appearance than to "take the book and eat it up" meant that St. John should literally eat it, although he did say afterwards that he—

Took the book from the hand of the angel, and eat it up; and it was in my mouth sweet as honey: and when I had eaten it, my belly was bitter (Apoc. 10:10).

Here he states it in as plain language as it possibly could be expressed, that he eat the book. But would it not have been absurd had he literally eaten the book by chewing and swallowing its leaves and covers, when to "eat it" meant, according to Scripture phraseology, to read it, imbibe and assimilate its teachings and follow them by a mental act of the mind and will and by deeds, "good fruits?" Yes.

But now it may be said that it was only a vision and there was no literal book to eat literally and it was therefore not absurd for him to have "eat it up" in vision. Granting it was only a vision and there was no literal book to eat, then could he not in vision have "read it" as well as he in vision "eat it up?" Yes. For it would have been just as easy to have said he "read it" as to say he "eat it up." Yet he says he "eat it up," which is just as clearly expressed an idea as to say, "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood," and the eating and drinking of them will be in your mouth "sweet as honey" and make your "belly bitter" and out of it "shall flow rivers of living waters." Why, then, take the one figuratively or metaphorically and the other literally, positively, when both expressions are recorded by the same person and the revelation in both is from the same Christ, and it would have been absurd had St. John literally "eat the book?" And if Christ here by the word "eat" did not mean a literal eating with the mouth, then why should His saying to "eat," in John 6: 52-58, mean a literal eating with the mouth? Would it not be as absurd to eat the flesh of anyone or "feed upon his body," in order to have his spirit and life, as it would be to eat a book with the mouth in order to learn its contents and character, or to believe that when the

Church says "this is an age fed on newspapers" (Papal Supremacy and Infallibility, Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S. J., p. 18), it means that the people now with their mouths literally eat, chew and swallow paper with printing on it, or "feed" upon newspapers as the Church would have us "feed upon the blessed body of Jesus?" Or, that when—

> Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, deposed by Pope Theodore, wrote: "We nourish ourselves in common with the spiritual food which Christ prepared for us through your writings" (Religious Unrest: The Way Out, James P. Lafferty, p. 28),

that the people of that Paul's day eat the writings of anyone for spiritual nourishment? But it may be said common sense and understanding would tell us newspapers and spiritual writings are not to be eaten in order to assimilate their contents. Well, common sense and understanding also tell us it is not by eating literally the literal flesh and drinking the blood of anyone that we imbibe and assimilate, put on, his spirit and life, so that we may receive a reward from him. It is the same with putting on the "spirit and life" of Christ, so as to receive a reward, everlasting life, from Him. To me it is now as plain as day, and it would so appear to others did they only use a little common sense and thought.

To "eat," then, as well as to "drink," according to Scripture phraseology, means to imbibe and assimilate certain things; if a book, its teachings; if a person, his spirit and life, by a mental act of the mind and will, not by a mouth-eating operation. Therefore, to "eat" Christ, "eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood," "he that eateth Me," etc., mean that we imbibe and assimilate Christ, that is, His "spirit and life,"

character and conduct, put Him on, by a mental act of the mind and will and by deeds—"going about doing good," just as one would with a book that was given one and one was told to "eat it up," devour it. And a person can be read as well as a book can be eat up. For occasionally one comes across such an expression as, "I have read him and I know what he is," although he was not literally read as one reads, "devours," consumes, a book, novel or magazine, simply meaning one has analyzed and observed his spirit and life, character and conduct.

It is the same with putting on Christ, eating Him. It means to imbibe and assimilate His spirit and life, character and teachings. And to know what they are we must go to the Gospel and writings of the Apostles and other inspired writings, or, as the Church would call it, Holy Writ. And had book-making in Christ's day been as easy and cheap as at present Christ would probably have written and published them Himself. And if He had, He would no doubt have told us to "take the book, and eat it up," just as He, through an angel, told St. John to "take the book, and eat it up," being an expression similar in meaning of operation or act as to "eat My flesh and drink My blood," that is, read Christ, His teachings, imbibe and assimilate them, as already stated a number of times. Now, is all that not plain, reasonable, comprehensible, consistent, involving no difficulties, contradictions and absurdities?

For to take John 6:48-59 literally would be as absurd as to take Eze. 3:1 or Apoc. 10:9 literally and "eat the book," the Bible, with the mouth in order to "taste the good word of God" (Heb. 6:5). It would also bar from heaven children under twelve

years of age, who died without ever having received Communion, "eat the flesh of the Son of Man."

Christ explained to His disciples what it meant to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," etc., when He said to them:

> It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life (John vi. 64).

That shows that to eat flesh literally, after a carnal manner, or even flesh veiled under another species, with the mouth "profiteth nothing," just as it would "profit nothing" were one to eat after a carnal manner the Bible in order to "taste the good word of God," or as it would have "profiteth nothing" had St. John after a carnal manner eat the book. And that explains why Christ, in explaining Himself to His disciples, did not tell them that He would one day give them His flesh and blood under the veils of bread and wine, but that His words meant "spirit and life," and that it would "profit nothing" to literally eat literal flesh, as it would "profit nothing" to literally "eat the book." But says the Church in an annotation to John 6:64:

> *The flesh profiteth nothing.* Dead flesh separated from the spirit, in the gross manner they supposed they were to eat his flesh, would profit nothing. Neither doth man's flesh, that is to say, man's natural and carnal apprehension (which refuses to be subject to the spirit, and words of Christ.) profit anything. But it would be the height of blasphemy, to say the living flesh of Christ (which we receive in the blessed sacrament, with his spirit, that is, with his soul and divinity) profiteth nothing. For if Christ's flesh had profiteth us nothing, he would never have taken flesh for us, nor died in the flesh for us.—*Ibid. Are spirit and life.* By proposing to you a heavenly sacrament, in which you shall receive in a wonderful manner, spirit, grace, and life, in its very fountain.

The Church in an annotation to verse 63, the one preceding the above, says:

If then you shall see, etc. Christ, by mentioning his ascension, by this instance of his power and divinity, would confirm the truth of what he had before asserted; and at the same time correct their gross apprehension of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, in a vulgar and carnal manner, by letting them know he should take his whole body living with him to heaven; and consequently not suffer it to be, as they supposed, divided, mangled and consumed upon earth.

How, then, does one "eat the flesh of the Son of Man" if there is no real flesh, indeed, of His on earth, such as the Jews understood (John 6:53) He would give them to eat? And what is it, then, that Catholics eat in Communion when they, as we saw, "feed upon the blessed body of Jesus," so that then the "blood of a God flows in their veins," if it is not "the living flesh of Christ, with His spirit, that is, with His soul and divinity?" Or does that which they eat and drink then merely represent the flesh and blood of that Christ who "should take His whole body living to heaven, and not suffer it to be divided, mangled. and consumed upon earth?" If so, then were not the Jews misled by Christ's repetition of eating His flesh, and where does the Real Presence of Christ "whole and entire", as He was when He spoke to the Jews, come in? And how does one "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," etc., if there is no real flesh, indeed, and no real blood, indeed, such as the Jews apparently understood they were to eat and drink, of Christ upon earth of which to partake? Does not the Church contradict herself and fall into difficulties in the teachings of those two annotations? Answer for yourself.

Christ did indeed in John 6:63, 64 "correct" His

disciples' "gross apprehension of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, in a vulgar and carnal manner," etc., and thereby made it plain to them that they were to receive the "spirit" (John 7:39), "by the hearing of faith" (Gal. 3:2), a mental operation of the mind and will, not by literally eating flesh of any kind, which would "profit nothing" towards the reception of the Spirit. He explained to them that the operation was not through a literal mouth-eating act of eating His supposed flesh; but that it must be by believing (John 7:39), "by the hearing of faith" (Gal. 3:2), mental acts of the mind and will. That is why He said:

> It is the spirit that quickeneth (which St. Paul said is received "by the hearing of faith"—Gal. iii. 2, not a mouth-eating act): the flesh (eaten with the mouth) profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life (John vi. 64).

How would you "eat" and "drink," put on, "spirit and life?" How would you "eat" and "drink" wisdom (Ecclus. 24:29)? Would you not do so through a mental act of the mind and will? Surely you would not do so by putting something into the mouth. Well, it is the same with receiving and putting on the "spirit" (John 7:39), drinking to quench the "thirst" (John 7:37), receiving the Spirit, "by the hearing of faith" (Gal. 3:2), putting on the "spirit and life" (John 6:64) of Christ, that is, in Scripture phraseology, to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," etc. (John 6:54.) Is that plain to you now? Had I the power to express myself as some have then I could probably make that as plain and clear to the reader as it is to me now. Then the reader would plainly see the great error of the Church in the matter in question.

Again, would Christ not be "divided and mangled" according to the following, were it practiced now?

The early Christians, especially in the time of persecution, did not receive holy communion as we do now, the priest laying the Sacred Host [God, as we saw] upon their tongue, but the Blessed Sacrament was laid on their hands, the priest saying at the same time the words: "Body of Christ," and the one who received it answered, "Amen." They then consumed a part of the Sacred Host [God] and wrapping the remainder [of God] in a white cloth, carried it home carefully, that they might quickly arm themselves with the bread of the strong, if the persecution should suddenly break out (Magazine, Tabernacle and Purgatory, February, 1906, p. 117. See also A History of the Mass, Rev. John O'Brien, A. M., pp. 375-377).

Now, if part of the Sacred Host, which is supposed to be Christ-God, is "consumed" and the remainder carried home and eaten under certain circumstances, then would not Christ-God be "divided and mangled," His soul and divinity be driven out of His flesh, so that it could be digested, assimilated and flow in the veins of a communicant as "the blood of God;" just as a rabbit would be "divided and mangled" that had been caught by a dog, was partly eaten or "consumed" and the remainder carried home or hid in the ground to be eaten later by the dog, as dogs sometimes do with a rabbit? Yes. The Church, then, contradicts herself and falls into unanswerable difficulties in what she teaches, does she not?

As we just saw, and as may be seen by the following, in the early days laymen were given the Sacred Host into their hands, and it was probably no sin to touch with their hands the Host, but now it is different:

It was customary during the first five or six centuries to place the Sacred Host in the hands of the communicant and let

him communicate himself. . . . It was abrogated about the beginning of the ninth century (A History of the Mass, Rev. O'Brien, pp. 375, 376).

Since that time it has become a mortal sin to even touch the vessels supposed to contain the body and blood of Christ-God, unless one is a "cleric."

So very particular is the Church regarding the respect that should be paid to the sacred vessels immediately concerned with the Holy Eucharist, that she forbids them, under pain of sin, to be touched by any one but a cleric. . . . Should any one wilfully touch the Chalice whilst it contains the Precious Blood, and not be at least in deacon's orders, all theologians hold that he would by so doing commit a mortal sin (*Ibid.*, pp. 79, 80).

Theologians, then, are not infallible in what they "hold," or else God is changeable. For if He permitted Himself to be at one time touched by the hands of laymen, without its being a "mortal sin," and now it is a mortal sin to even touch the vessels supposed to contain Him, then He has changed, has He not? This supreme reverence that now attaches to so-called "sacred vessels" is the result of "the advance of the sacerdotal theory" and the doctrine of the Real Presence, strongly developed since "about the beginning of the ninth century," when laymen were no longer permitted to touch the Sacred Host—except with their mouths and stomachs.

Again, if the presence of Christ ceases as soon as the Host ceases "because of digestion," which is "about fifteen minutes after receiving," then of what use or benefit would that be to one who was martyred an hour or so after he communicated himself; for Christ would, then, no longer be with him?

Again, did not "Christ's flesh profit us" when in the flesh He gave us the gospel of faith, repentance

and hope of an everlasting life, and in His flesh, person, gave us a model after which to pattern our lives, and revealed to us the true character of God; just as the flesh of Columbus profited us, when in the flesh he discovered America? And so on with all men who in their flesh made discoveries and inventions, gave them to the world and made life for flesh, people to come, more pleasant and comfortable. For Christ, then, to take flesh did profit us, did it not, even though it was not to be eaten, "consumed," in Communion? Yes. A poor argument, then, of the Church to say that if to eat the flesh of Christ after a literal manner "profiteth us nothing, He would never have taken flesh for us?" Besides, how could we eat it, indeed, if He took "His whole body living to heaven?" It is a case of "now you do, and now you do not," eat His flesh. Or does transubstantiation really make new Christ-Gods on earth, with beginnings, beginning existence where the substances of bread and wine cease to be any longer bread and wine?

Again, if we receive by faith in Communion the same flesh of Christ which He had "taken for us" and in which He "died for us," then is it not still after the manner of cannibalism to communicate, if what is eaten in Communion is really and indeed "the living flesh of Christ," under the veil of bread?

The Church says further:

> Had Christ said my flesh is meat indeed, that is, my flesh is true food, and then *my* flesh profits nothing, He would have contradicted Himself (Mission Tracts, Rev. Thos. E. Sherman, S. J., pp. 55, 56).

He would no more have contradicted Himself than St. Paul did when he said:

And they who are in the flesh, cannot please God (Rom. viii. 9).

But (for me) to abide still in the flesh, is needful for you (Phil. i. 24).

"Flesh" in those cases has two meanings. It was the same when Christ used the word "flesh" in John 6:56 and 64. If you are able to discern the difference in the meaning of the word "flesh" as St. Paul used it, then you will also be able to discern the difference in the ways Christ used it, and will see that He would not "have contradicted Himself."

Again, when the early Christians "consumed a part of the Sacred Host and carried the remainder of it home," and the "flesh of God is imperishable meat"—which then means they could not in reality "consume" God—did they divide God asunder into pieces or disjoint Him, which pieces would later, after the remainder of the Host had become "consumed," rejoin each other again as a jointed snake does that has been divided into parts? Or did they consume only "appearances" and leave the substance of God, supposed to underlie the "species," intact, undivided? If so, then how did they, "indeed," "eat the flesh of the Son of Man?" Think of that again when reading or hearing of a time when people "consumed a part of the Sacred Host and wrapped the remainder in a white cloth and carried it home" to be consumed later, and if a Sacred Host contains but one ego, mind and consciousness that are as indivisible without being destroyed as is man's ego, mind and consciousness.

Surely, the doctrine of the Real Presence can not be true, in view of what we have noted. And John 6th, then, can not be taken in the literal sense even if the Jews did "at that time." And it is, then, no criterion

for us to take John 6th in a literal, positive sense because the Jews, or even the Apostles at the time, may have understood Christ as speaking in the plain, obvious and literal sense and said: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"

John 6th, then, does not support the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, does it? No, most plainly not.

CHAPTER VI.

The Church cites the following also in support of her doctrine of the Real Presence:

> The chalice of benediction, which we bless (Not transubstantiate), is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not partaking of the body of the Lord (1 Cor. x. 16)?

But if we read on, including verse 21, which says:

> You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils: you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils,

then it may be seen that the "chalice of benediction" and "the bread, which we break," signify or represent the Lord's table, His memorial of remembrance; just as the "chalice of devils," and the "table of devils," signify or represent his banquet, and does not mean that they contain or there is inherent in them the "whole and entire" devil, upon whose bodies the heathens fed, so that then the "blood of a devil" flowed in their veins, as the "blood of a God" is supposed to flow in the veins of those who "partake of the table of the Lord," or who "feed upon His blessed body," as we already saw.

For surely there is no transubstantiation of material substances, the "chalice of devils" and the things upon the "table of devils," into literal "whole and entire" living devil or devils; just as there is no transubstantiation, for instance, of the food and drink

upon a banquet table of George Washington into George Washington, when a banquet is given to commemorate his birthday. Yet we speak of it as George Washington's banquet or table, and anyone who had in any way offended against his memory, and should partake of the banquet, would bring "judgment to himself," even though the food and drink on the table do not veil the flesh and blood of Washington. The same is it with the "table of the Lord," of which we partake simply of blessed bread and wine, as they did at the Last Supper. And anyone who was not Christ-like in life, character and deeds, or who offended against the memory or person of Christ, would be unworthy to partake of it and would bring "judgment" or "condemnation" upon himself by partaking of it. In view of that, then, the citation of I Cor. 10: 16, as proof of a Real Presence of Christ in Communion bread and wine, does not prove it, does it?

We have now examined the strong texts and arguments the Church makes use of in her attempt to prove that there is a Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but found that they really do not support her doctrine, and found she greatly erred in the matter in question. But now it may be asked, if the Church, which claims to have been established by Christ, has erred in so important a doctrine as the one in question, then:

> Does it seem reasonable that He, if He is a lover of souls, should let His Church fall into so great an error, or, how can He escape just censure and impeachment for letting her fall into so great an error?

Well, probably as reasonable and for somewhat like reasons that He let the Jewish Church, which He

established, and the Jews, His one time "chosen people," whose souls He no doubt also loved, become "blind, and leaders of the blind" (Matt. 15:14), fall into idolatry, which Christ, as we saw, came to abolish, and fall into the error of wrongly interpreting the prophecies pertaining to their promised Messiah, so that when He did come they instead of seeing He was the Messiah and accepting Him, they rejected Him and crucified Him as a "seducer," guilty of "blasphemy" (Matt. 26:65, 66). It may have been for somewhat like reasons, which caused the Jewish Church to fall into error and idolatry, that God let the Church, her spiritual directors and teachers, who are supposed to be "infallible teachers of authority," become "blind, and leaders of the blind" and fall into the error of misinterpreting certain passages of Scripture; just as did the Jewish Church, her high priests and "rulers of the synagogue," who were supposed to have been preserved from error in the interpretation of Scripture and were "therefore infallible teachers" (Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. S. Keenan, pp. 369, 370; The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, pp. 118, 119), fall into error concerning their belief about the "promised Son of David" and the prophecies concerning Him. And the Jews and their high priests were just as much the people of God as the Catholics and their Popes may be.

That the Catholic Church, which now teaches the doctrine of the Real Presence, has departed from the teachings and belief of the Apostles is evident from the fact that the Apostles' Creed, formulated by them, "which it is necessary to believe unto salvation" (The Real Presence, Rev. C. F. Smarius, p. 24), and which is supposed to present "a complete summary of

Catholic doctrine" (Essentials and Non-Essentials of the Catholic Religion, Rev. H. G. Hughes, p. 31), does not mention or even intimate the doctrine. Yet their Creed mentions that Christ was "born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate," "descended into hell," the "communion of saints, the forgiveness of sin, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting," things which are not of any more, if of as much, importance to man's belief, right living and salvation than is that of the doctrine of the Real Presence, a doctrine which, with its concomitants, the Church has made the center and "keystone" of her teachings and devotions. Had the Apostles believed in the doctrine of the Real Presence and had regarded it as the "central dogma" of their faith, as the Church does now, they would without doubt have incorporated it in their profession of faith or Creed about as follows:

I believe in the presence of the Lord in blessed bread and wine; or, I believe in the mystical presence of Christ in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper; or I believe in the real presence of Christ, with His body and blood, Soul and Divinity in the consecrated bread and wine.

But the fact that they did not incorporate in their Creed such a belief makes it very self-evident they did not believe in the doctrine. That is the only way to account for it; for they were courageous and did not fear to "declare all the counsel of God" (Acts 20:27). Neither did St. Paul mention or intimate the doctrine in Heb. 6:1, 2, where he, as it were, recapitulated what they taught, enumerated "the fundamental truths of Christianity" (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 321).

The Church would have us now believe that the "Discipline of the Secret" (A History of the Mass,

Rev. O'Brien, p. 247) forbade the doctrine to be taught openly up to the sixth century, so as not to expose it "to public ridicule or misinterpretation" (Plain Facts For Fair Minds, Rev. G. M. Searle, pp. 62, 87), as though the doctrine of the Resurrection was not ridiculed, "mocked" (Acts 17:32) in the days of the Apostles. That therefore "the early fathers say little or nothing about the Real Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist" (A History of the Mass, Rev. O'Brien, p. 247), and that that may be a reason for its not being incorporated in the Apostles' Creed. But the "Discipline of the Secret" extended to other doctrines as well. Why, then, did the Apostles write a Creed at all? Or why mention the "resurrection of the body," when it was ridiculed, "mocked," in their day? And if they wrote a Creed and kept it secret in their day, could they not have incorporated in it the doctrine of the Real Presence, just as they did that of the Resurrection, had they believed in it? Yes. But their silence on it makes it very self-evident they did not believe in it nor teach it. That is why their Creed does not mention or intimate the doctrine.

But it may be said that the doctrine is implied in that part of the Creed which says: "I believe in the holy Catholic Church," that to believe in her means believing in all that she teaches, and that, therefore, it was not necessary to specifically mention the doctrine of the Real Presence. If that is the case, then why write a long Creed at all? Why not just simply say: "I believe in the holy Catholic Church?" For that, then, would imply believing "in God the Father Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ," and in everything she teaches.

Just when the erroneous doctrine of the Real Pres-

ence crept into the Christian Church may probably never be definitely known. But it seems to have crept in in some vague and varying form soon after the death of the Apostles, just like the Galatians already in St. Paul's day became "bewitched" into believing that the spirit was to be received "by the works of the law," instead of "by the hearing of faith" (Gal. 3:1, 2), and appears to have been introduced as a Eucharistic rite in some places by early Church Fathers. as a concession to the pagan converts to Christianity, who had been accustomed to a eucharistic rite of one kind or another while they were pagans, to satisfy them that they had not lost anything materially or essential by giving up paganism. That is no doubt how and when the error crept into the Christian Church, which error in time, by the development of rites and ceremonies, became the "center of the Christian life" of the Roman Catholic Church, her "most important doctrine," "keystone of worship," etc. For according to the following the Host or Eucharist and sacrifice is of "pagan origin," so that by surrounding it with "mysteries" it could in time be developed into "a God" and a sacrifice, in the Church:

> According to Durandus, the word "host" as applied to the consecrated wafer is of pagan deriviation. It comes from the word *hostio,* to strike, referring to the victim offered to the gods after a victory. This word is also used in the Bible in the sense of representing the matter or victim of the sacrifice. The application of the word "host" to the Blessed Sacrament came into general use about the tenth century (The Sacred Heart Union, Rev. Thomas J. Moran, January, 1908, p. 7).

The "tenth century" is characterized by historians as a part of the so-called "Dark Ages." It is the century following the one when laymen were no longer

given the Host in their hands to communicate themselves, and when it became a mortal sin to "wilfully touch the Chalice whilst it contains the precious blood," unless one is "at least in deacon's orders."

In view, then, of all that we have noted, it may easily be perceived that the doctrine of the Real Presence is a manifest error, etc., it being simply the substitution of the Eucharistic "a God" made, as we saw, "out of a piece of bread," by "the word of a priest," for the pagan gods of wood, stone or metal.

It is said that the prophet Daniel proved to the pagans that the dragon was not a god, by making a composition of tar, tow, etc., giving it to the dragon to eat and by eating it it was killed. And of course the pagans could no longer believe that anything that could die was a god. Can it not likewise be said that the Eucharist is not a God, if rats can eat it, fire can consume it and "natural heat" and digestion can destroy it, or make His presence to cease?

As the Eucharist, then, is not the "living God," but only a piece of blessed bread, then it also makes it, notwithstanding the Church's denial (The Real Presence, Rev. Smarius, pp. 36, 37), a species of pagan idoltary and superstition to adore and worship it as God, as the Church does in Mass; in Forty-Hour Devotion; in Perpetual Adoration, which requires for each such adoration a yearly expenditure for candles alone of $2,555 (Magazine, Perpetual Adoration, 1905, p. 2); in Corpus Christi, and other, processions; in Benediction; etc. And the only real difference there seems to be between the way Catholics treat their God and the pagans their god, is that the former eat their God while the latter feed theirs, that is, they place food before their god, which the pagan priests sneak

out of the temple during the night, eat and then make their blind, credulous, unthinking and superstitious followers believe their god ate it (Dan. 14: 10-14). That is about all the real difference there is between Catholic idoltary and pagan idoltary; the Catholics eat their God, while the pagans feed theirs. And is that not true if in Communion God is "our food" (How to Make the Mission, a Dominican Father, p. 118); that is, when Catholics "feed upon the blessed body of Jesus," God, so that then the "blood of a God flows in their veins?"

That there is no Real Presence in the Eucharist, and that it is, therefore, not Supernatural, may be known by its effects upon those who receive it; for "by their fruits you shall know them," or what things really are.

The Church teaches the following about the efficacy of Communion:

> It confers actual grace and preserves us from mortal sin. . . . By the grace of Holy Communion we shall be enabled to subdue our passions, to conquer our evil inclinations (A Pious Preparation for First Holy Communion, Rev. F. X. Lasance, pp. 336, 342).
>
> At its table unfortunate creatures degraded by sensuality, are changed into angels of chastity.—Rt. Rev. Nicholas C. Matz (Catholic Register, January 19, 1906).
>
> The Church teaches that as the body is nourished by food, so really is the soul made strong in virtue and holiness by the sacramental presence of Jesus Christ (Tract, The Gospel Church, Catholic Book Exchange, p. 5).

But how can He make one "strong in virtue and holiness" by His "sacramental presence," if His "sacramental presence" lasts only "about fifteen minutes," when He takes His leave because of the destruction

by "natural heat" of the "species?" Another difficulty, eh?

Fortified with Communion, we can persevere on the way of the commandments of God, and make the journey to our heavenly country without difficulty (Short Sermons for Low Masses, Rev. F. Heffner, p. 59).

Communion is not that bread which changes into the substance of man, but that which changes man even into the same substance as God (Catholic Ceremonies, Abbe Durand, p. 84).

The following are what Catholic writers have to say about the morals of Catholics at certain times:

In ancient times, when the male portion of the congregation was separated from the female portion, the kiss of peace went through the entire church; and this discipline continued, with little interruption, up to the time of Pope Innocent III.—that is, until the thirteenth century—when, on account of *the increasing depravity of morals* (Italics are mine.), and from other causes, it was deemed prudent to discontinue the practice (A History of The Mass, Rev. John O'Brien, A. M., pp. 364, 365).

What we now call "graft" was a pretty common abuse in Luther's time. It was perhaps almost as bad then as it is to-day. But it was a much greater scandal than it is now, because many persons guilty of it were churchmen, and not merely city or state officials. The crime of simony, that is selling sacred things for money or its equivalent, has often been a plague to the Church. It has done an immense amount of harm, chiefly by getting unworthy men into sacred offices (Luther, Rev. Charles Coppens, p. 12).

Luther threw open monasteries and convents, and gave leave to the monks and nuns to marry. . . . Finally, he broke the vow of chastity which he had solemnly made as a monk and as a priest, and committed the double sacrilege of taking a nun for his wife (The Faith That Never Dies, or The Priest of God in the Catholic Home, p. 501).

What was the Council of Trent but a great reforming tribunal. Most of its decrees are directed to the reformation of abuses among the clergy and the laity, and the salutary fruits of its legislation are reaped even to this day. . . . It cannot be

denied that corruption of morals prevailed in the sixteenth century to such an extent as to call for a sweeping reformation, and that laxity of discipline invaded even the sanctuary (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, pp. 47, 48).

Bishop Robert of Strassburg (d. 1478) never celebrated Mass, but was accustomed to receive Communion on Holy Thursday, in order to comply with his Easter duty—So as not to be excommunicated (The Eve of The Reformation, Part 1, Rev. William Stang, p. 61).

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Boucher (died 1486), . . . held diocesan visitations, and in a pastoral letter denounced abuses among his clergy. . . Cardinal John Morton (d. 1500), Archbishop of Canterbury, . . . made efforts in promoting ecclesiastical discipline among the clergy, whom he strictly forbade of entering taverns, "censuring a custom they had adopted of so arranging their hair as to conceal their tonsure, and of otherwise wearing their garments so as to prevent them from being distinguished from the laity" (*Ibid.*, pp. 69, 81).

(That partly sheds light on how it was possible for a king to separate England from the Roman Catholic Church.)

We will readily grant that a reformation in the lives of many unworthy churchmen of the day (The Sixteenth Century) was imperatively needed, and that unless many Catholics of the period had been living most corrupt lives, they never would have abandoned the Church (Question-Box Answers, Rev. B. L. Conway, p. 133).

Yet say that Christ in Communion "transforms us into Himself"—Bishop Hedley (Ave Maria, September 26, 1908, p. 402).

I could quote more Catholic writers on the morals of Catholics, but what I have quoted must suffice. Here is "what was the religion of all Europe at the time Luther was born," which was near the beginning of the sixteenth century:

All believed what the Catholics believe at the present time (Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. Stephen Keenan, p. 15).

According to the foregoing, the belief of the religious people prior to the Reformation of the sixteenth century, which is the belief of the Church and her members at the present time, was, that the reception of the Eucharist in Communion would "preserve us from mortal sin," enable us "to subdue our passions," changes "unfortunate creatures degraded by sensuality into angels of chastity," that it makes the soul "strong in virtue and holiness," that "fortified with it, we can persevere on the way of the commandments of God," that it "changes man even into the same substance as God," and that in Communion Christ "transforms us into Himself." But do the Catholic writings from which I have just quoted bear out those claims the Church makes for the efficacy of Communion? No. That, then, makes it very self-evident that there is no Real Presence in the Eucharist and that it is not Supernatural, but is only a piece of blessed bread; just as the bread on a dining table is blessed bread, over which one has asked God's blessing by saying grace.

By the quotations given of Catholic writers, it may also be seen that not only is the Eucharist not Supernatural, but that the Mass, Catholic Sacraments and Sacramentals are also not Supernatural nor channels of Supernatural and sanctifying graces, as the Church claims. For if they were so then they would and should have prevented such "increasing depravity of morals," "corruption of morals," "most corrupt lives," "graft," etc., as prevailed when "the religion of all Europe was Catholic." Is that not so? Yes. And that moral corruptions, etc., must have been some-

thing most appalling at the time of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, may be known from the fact that whole provinces fell away from the Roman Catholic Church in very short spaces of time. For such a thing would not now take place even though a bright, magnetic and prominent churchman, though he were a Cardinal, left the Church. He might induce and influence a few here and there to leave the Church, but for whole provinces or the majority of his parish or diocese to leave the Church, or for monks and nuns in large numbers to leave their cloisters and marry, would be entirely out of the question. Must not, then, the "corruption of morals," etc., have been something most appalling at the time of the Reformation of the sixteenth century when whole provinces; yea, the majority of a great kingdom, and monks and nuns in large numbers, left the Church? Yes. What, then, does that prove? Does it not prove that the Eucharist the Mass, the Catholic Sacraments and Sacramentals are most evidently not Supernatural nor channels of sanctifying graces, and that the Spirit must be received "by the hearing of faith"—words of truth?

"By their fruits you shall know them"—the Eucharist, the Mass, etc.

In one of the quotations we saw that simony "has done an immense amount of harm, chiefly by getting unworthy men into sacred offices." Yet the Church would have us believe that God chooses and calls "men into sacred offices." If that is so, then why is it that the Popes, as a rule, were Italians, and the present Pope Pius X. is an Italian? It is not because God chooses the Pope, but because in the electoral college, which elects the Pope, the majority are Italians, as may be seen by the following:

> The recent death of Cardinal Cretoni [An Italian], reduces the number of Cardinals to fifty-four. . . . Thirty-two of the Cardinals are Italians, the remaining twenty-two being divided throughout the Catholic world (The Catholic Register, March 5, 1909).

The highest number of Cardinals of any one nation, outside of Italy, is "six in Austria-Hungary." That puts the Italian Cardinals way in the majority, and you can rest assured that they will always vote for an Italian for Pope, and the living Pope will always see to it that the Italian Cardinals will be in the majority in the electoral college at his death; for the Pope appoints the Cardinals. That is no doubt also the reason why America, with about fifteen million Catholics, has at present but one Cardinal, while Italy, with about twice as many Catholics as America, has thirty-two times as many Cardinals as America has. It is not God, then, who chooses the Pope, is it? No. For if He did, then is it possible that no man in America, England, France, Germany, Ireland or Austria-Hungary ever is devout, spiritual, intelligent and learned enough to be chosen to the office of the Papacy, so that God must always choose an Italian?

In mentioning why the Popes, as a rule, are Italians, I do not want it understood that I would insinuate that they use "graft" in order to secure the office of the Papacy. I just mentioned it to show why, as a rule, the Popes have been Italians. For I used to wonder why, until I made the discovery why Italians have been the Popes. And perhaps you have wondered, too.

Now back to where we digressed. The reason why Catholics in this country now live lives of a higher moral standard than the Catholics did when

"the religion of all Europe was Catholic," is because of the fear of criticism of their conduct by Protestants, some of whom live lives of "a high moral standard" (Catholic Belief, Very Rev. Joseph Faá Di Bruno, p. 160), and it is not because of the supposed Supernatural character of the Eucharist, the Mass, etc., that Catholics make frequent use of, that makes them live lives of a higher moral standard than the Catholics did prior to the Reformation.

That it is a fact that the fear of Catholics as to what Protestants might say or think of their conduct has some influence or acts as a restraint on it, I will show by an incident. One Sunday afternoon, during Lent, a priest in the country, at the home of one of his parishioners, was playing cards with them. While they were playing some Protestant neighbors came to make a call. When their coming was announced the priest said to those with whom he had been playing cards:

> Hurry up, and put away the cards before they (the callers) see them; for what would Protestants think of us if they saw or knew we had been playing cards, and especially on Sunday, and in Lent.

(In Lent Catholics are supposed to "mortify" themselves and make "reparation" for the sins of the past year, by denying themselves and shunning amusements of about all kinds.)

And other Catholics will say: "What will Protestants say if I did this or that?" And thus that thought restrains some from doing things they otherwise would do. With many of them it is not, "What would God say?" but "What would Protestants say?" By that, then, it may be seen that the fear of criticism of their conduct by Protestants has some bearing or influence

on the conduct of Catholics, and no doubt *vice versa,* and which no doubt to some extent is what makes some Catholics now live lives of "a high moral standard," and that it is not due to the attendance at Mass, the reception of the Eucharist and the use of Sacramentals. And this fear of criticism of conduct by Protestants was lacking when "the religion of all Europe was Catholic." That is or was the reason why there was such "corruption of morals," "increasing depravity of morals," etc., among the Catholics who lived prior to the Reformation of the sixteenth century. No other cause or reason than that can be given; for those Catholics had the same kind of Masses, Sacraments and Sacramentals that Catholics now have, who live lives of a higher moral standard than the Catholics did when "the religion of all Europe" was Catholic. Is that not a fair and reasonable inference and deduction? Yes.

"By their fruits you shall know them"—the Eucharist, the Mass, Catholic Sacraments and Sacramentals. Sacramentals are Holy Water, Blessed Medals, Scapulars, Candles, etc., and are distinguished in their effects from the Sacraments as follows:

> The Sacraments effect immediately inward sanctification, whereas the Sacramentals, by imparting subordinate graces, only contribute towards it, and protect us also from temporal evils (Deharbe's Catechism No. 1, p. 308).

And they—

> Have to be filled with a strange undefinable power by ecclesiastical benediction (All For Jesus, Father Faber, p. 111).

For further proof that there is nothing Supernatural or sanctifying about the Eucharist, is the fact that St. Peter denied our Lord the very night he had

supposedly received Christ, or rather two Christs, in Communion at the Last Supper. And if Communion direct from the hands of Christ Himself did not "preserve" St. Peter from the "mortal sins" of lying, cursing, swearing (Mark 14:68-71) and denying our Lord, then that is conclusive and positive proof there is nothing Supernatural about the Eucharist, that there is no Real Presence of Christ in it, but that it is only as so much blessed bread and wine, as Communion bread and wine are regarded in most of the "Protestant communions."

The best illustration that can be used to show there is nothing Supernatural about the Eucharist, the Mass, etc., is that of a priest who falls in love with his housekeeper, and in time marries her. Of course, it may be said that priests are as human as other people, have the same kind of weaknesses and temptations to contend with that other people have, and that, therefore, my illustration is not the best that can be used. Granting that priests are human and have the same kind of weaknesses, passions and temptations that other people have, should they not, above all others, be less controlled by them than others are, if there is any truth to the claims the Church makes for the Mass, Sacraments, etc? Yes.

Before proceeding with the illustration, we will look at a few more of the claims the Church makes for Communion.

The most chaste flesh of Jesus keeps down the rebellion of our flesh, as St. Cyril of Alexandria taught, "For Christ abiding in us lulls to sleep the law of the flesh which rages in our members" (God With Us: Letter From Pope Leo XIII. on the Most Holy Eucharist, p. 15).

Will "about fifteen minutes" of Christ's "abiding

in us" once a month or quarterly or yearly "lull to sleep the law of the flesh which rages in our members?" If so, then should it not more effectively "lull to sleep the law of the flesh which rages" in a priest who daily has "about fifteen minutes" the abiding presence of Christ supposedly in him?

Bear in mind also that the fruits of your Communion do not depend solely on your own efforts (Frequent and Daily Communion, Father Lintelo, S. J., p. 34).

Communion is intended to give us strength to fight Christ's battles, irrespective of our weakness—Rev. John H. O'Rourke, S. J. (Messenger of the Sacred Heart, June, 1909, p. 350).

The oftener a person communicates, the more I operate in him and he in Me, and his works will be made great—Our Lord to St. Mechtildis (Tabernacle and Purgatory, May, 1906, p. 6).

Go to Communion frequently. . . . He will sustain you in your conflicts with the devil (How to Make The Mission, a Dominican Father, p. 40).

It is above all the remedy against concupiscence. Every day in Holy Mass the Church proclaims this healing power which belongs to the Flesh of our divine Lord. . . . Doctors of the Church have vied with each other in teaching that it is not more natural for water to extinguish fire, than for the Body of Christ to appease in our souls the heat of concupiscence, and what would our Lord do in the soul to which He unites Himself, if, above all, He did not give it the love of purity, and the strength to practice it? (Frequent and Daily Communion, Rev. Lintelo, p. 21).

And if it were certain that in time the Eucharistic food would be more frugally used we should hasten to fortify those temperaments most exposed to weakness, degeneration and death by giving them, while we may, a powerful dose of the Bread of Life. —About Frequent Communion of Children (Sentinel of the Blessed Sacrament, December, 1907, p. 379).

The most efficacious, the most inexhaustible remedy for this concupiscence, the febrifuge that lessens its assaults, the powerful tonic that strengthens against its attack, is very frequent Communion. It diminishes concupiscence and represses the passions.

Holy Communion, by that very fact, preserves from mortal sin, of which they are the direct cause (*Ibid.*, August, 1906, p. 236).

In view of those quotations, there seems to be no possible excuse for any priest, who communicates daily, ever to fall in love with a woman, sometimes getting her into a family way and then have to marry her. Now for the illustration: A boy is placed in a college, spending his vacations there, at about twelve years of age, or at least before the age of puberty, to study for the priesthood. He sprinkles himself daily with Holy Water, which is believed will protect us—

In all dangers of soul and body (Deharbe's Catechism No. 1, p. 310). And—

The Church employs it in the most solemn religious ceremonies. This water, through the blessings of the Church, is possessed of most singular and efficacious virtues. It has the property of purifying everything it touches, and banishing demons, and destroying the evil influences that dwell in the air and surround our habitation (Benedictine Parish Monthly, December, 1909, p. 8).

He is enrolled in at least one Scapular,

Which would be to him and to all who carried it, a badge of the Blessed Virgin's special protection (Goffine, Rev. Leonard Goffine, p. 799).

He received in due time his First Communion, and was confirmed.

Confirmation increases sanctifying grace in us; gives us the Holy Ghost, to enable us to fight against evil and to grow in virtue (Deharbe's Catechism No. 1, p. 254).

Received in his ordination the Sacrament of Holy Orders,

Which communicates to those who receive it the full power of Priesthood, together with a special grace to discharge their sacred duties well (Ibid., p. 298).

One of the "sacred duties" is to keep the vow of perpetual chastity, or celibacy, which all candidates for the priesthood make.

After he was ordained a priest he said Mass, for which he put on sacred vestments, and while putting them on said:

> Gird me, O Lord, with the cincture of purity and extinguish in my loins the fire of concupiscence, that the virtue of continence and chastity may abide in me (Benedictine Parish Monthly, October, 1909, p. 8).

In saying Mass daily, of which the Church says:

> The Holy Mass obtains for us all graces and blessings, temporal and spiritual (Reasonableness of Catholic Ceremonies and Practices, Rev. J. J. Burke, p. 22),

he communicated under both forms, virtually receiving double Communion—two Christ-Gods—which is certainly receiving "a powerful dose of the Bread of Life," which is supposed to effect or produce the results mentioned already.

Surely all that should have always kept down, subdued, lulled, repressed his passions of love and sexual feelings for woman, were there such supernatural graces and sanctifying efficacies in them as the Church claims. In fact, they should have, as it were, made him in feeling as a eunuch, should have completely unmanned him in his feelings, passions and desires for the opposite sex. The housekeeper was also a good and devout Catholic when she went to keep house for him; for no other kind is usually given to the occupation of keeping house for priests. Now does not such a case of breaking the vows of perpetual chastity, or celibacy —of which there were getting to be so many that in some dioceses regulations have been made that no

woman under a certain age, unless she is a blood relative of the priest, can be his housekeeper, completely shatter the teachings of the Church that Communion—

> Keeps down the rebellion of our flesh; lulls to sleep the law of the flesh which rages in our members; gives us strength to fight Christ's battles; will make our works great; will sustain you in your conflicts with the devil—passions, instincts and desires—; is above all the remedy against concupiscence; appeases in our souls the heat of concupiscence; gives the soul the love of purity, and the strength to practice it; fortifies those temperaments most exposed to weakness, the most efficacious remedy for this concupiscence, the powerful tonic that strengthens against its attack; diminishes concupiscence and represses the passions, and preserves from mortal sin?

And surely if anyone receives "a powerful dose of th Bread of Life," to "sustain him in his conflicts with the devil"—procreative passions, it is a priest who says Mass daily and communicates at each one, even communicating three times on Christmas, when he says, or is supposed to say, three Masses.

Yet of the priests who leave the Church, even though they leave for apparent causes other than "cherchez la femme," the Church invariably says it was because of "cherchez la femme" (Catholic Register, 1908), or, "women and wine are usually at the bottom of such deplorable downfalls" (Ibid.), or, "the woman in the case is evident," or, "apostate Priests as a class are abandoned men and slaves of sensuality" (Truth, May, 1906, p. 15), even though some may leave the Church on account of "Modernism" (Catholic Register, 1908), or some other reason than "cherchez la femme." The more, then, that the Church stigmatizes her ex-priests with that of "cherchez la femme," etc., the more does it prove my claim that there is abso-

lutely nothing Supernatural nor sanctifying about the Eucharist, the Mass, Catholic Sacraments and Sacramentals, and that they are only make-believes, etc., and that the Spirit must be received "by the hearing of faith." The further fact that unmarried Catholic men and women, who go to Mass only on Sundays and holy days, and communicate only monthly, or quarterly, and members of Protestant churches, live without "sexual commerce" (Webster), proves that it is not Communion that makes them live thus. For if it were, then no priest should ever fall on account of "cherchez la femme," for priests receive Communion daily, and no unmarried Protestant man or woman could live without "sexual commerce," but which they do.

"By their fruits you shall know them."

As I am not an ex-priest, nor ever studied for the priesthood, nor was married and wanted an annulment by the Church of the marriage so that I could marry another woman, the charge of "cherchez la femme" cannot be brought against me as a reason for my becoming a non-Catholic and leaving the Church.

Another proof that the Eucharist is not Supernatural, nor Communion a channel of sanctifying graces, is the fact that children are no better after having received their First Communion than they were before they received it; for the older they become the more hardened sinners many of them become. The one thing in the Church that does more to restrain her members from committing sin than all else in the Church put together is Confession, as may be inferred from the following:

The very thought of having to tell Father Francis (in the confessional) keeps us from doing many things we otherwise

would do.—A Catholic Girl to a Protestant at a Convent (Within and Without the Fold, Minnie Mary Lee, p. 161).

It is, then, not an inner sanctification or "inward grace" derived from the reception of Communion that "preserves from mortal sin," but the fear and thought of having to tell their sins to a priest in the confessional that restrains Catholics from doing "many things they otherwise would do."

The reason Confession did not prevent "increasing depravity of morals," and the "corruption of morals," when the "religion of all Europe" was Catholic, was, because, as we saw, "laxity of discipline invaded even the sanctuary," "graft" and "abuses among the clergy." Penitents, then, knowing that their Confessors were to some extent likewise as guilty of like sins as they, would not fear to confess "many things they otherwise would not do." That is why, when the "religion of all Europe" was Catholic, and "laxity of discipline invaded even the sanctuary," etc., that Confession was no longer—

The greatest bulwark against wickedness the world ever knew (Question-Box Answers, Rev. B. L. Conway, p. 153),

and why there was an "increasing depravity of morals," why "corruption of morals prevailed," and why "many Catholics of the period were living most corrupt lives." There are always causes for such things, if we only knew them, and we know now what they were.

If the following are true, then it seems there would be no need of going to Confession to a priest; for it should be far better to confess direct to Christ-God, if we have sinned against Him:

Our Lord Jesus Christ has not left us. He is always in the

Blessed Sacrament in person, just as He formerly was in Palestine (Perpetual Adoration, 1908, p. 8).

The Blessed Eucharist secures for us, first of all, the abiding presence of Christ in our midst; and this is in itself a blessing for which we can never thank Him sufficiently. . . . That Jesus of Nazareth is as truly present with us as He was with the Jews of old [Must, then, be after the manner of cannibalism to communicate]. Every Catholic church is His house. There upon the altar, in the dark and lonely Tabernacle, He dwells in as true sense as we dwell in our own houses. There we can approach Him as could His own disciples when He dwelt visibly among men. He is there present for the same purpose that induced Him to traverse the country of Palestine:—to do good to all. His house is always open to us: it is the house of the best of fathers, the house of the truest of friends; where sympathy and encouragement are always bestowed by the hand that knows how to bless. His delight is to be with the children of men, and to gladden their hearts with the sunshine of His love (The Sacramental Life of The Church, Rev. Bernard J. Otten, S. J., pp. 116, 117).

Jesus Christ Himself said to His Apostles before leaving them and to all the faithful succeeding them: "I will not leave you orphans." and in the Holy Reserve of the Eucharist this same Master and Savior truly abides with us. He is our God and Father and His delight is to be with the children of men (Sentinel of The Blessed Sacrament, January, 1908, p. 15).

This promise of our Lord, "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20), given for the solace and support of Christianity, has been fulfilled for nearly nineteen centuries. Christ abides with us in the sacred seclusion of the Tabernacle, really and actually. His sovereign majesty is veiled under the appearance of a wafer; but His divine power, His infinite goodness, is felt by the Christian, who in full faith and confidence kneels at the foot of the altar to adore the Blessed Sacrament. . . . Jesus in the Adorable Sacrament of the Altar calls to us, encouraging some by His favors, admonishing others by His chastisements (Tabernacle and Purgatory, August, 1905, p. 49).

In order to see this King of kings it is not necessary to crave or prearrange an audience. We may come to Him at any time,

at any hour. He is always in His Sacrament, in His Tabernacle; always attentive, always listening. Jesus listens: He listens to all we tell Him, nothing can ever disconcert His wisdom, rise above His power, tire His love. He is there to see our sorrows more closely, to console us more easily. . . . Oh! you who are lonely and disheartened and say: I have no one to whom I can speak, no one to listen to me, no one to understand me, no one to sympathize with me. No one! Oh! hush, in case you grieve His listening heart. No one! And He is there for that very purpose, with a longing far greater that your own to listen to you, to sympathize with you, to comfort you [By telling you, "Thy sins are forgiven thee, go in peace?"], aye, more, to love you in His own tender compassionate way, to help you and make you happy (Sentinel of the Blessed Sacrament, June, 1908, pp. 176, 177).

A little child, as the legend runs, hearing that our Lord was really present in the Blessed Sacrament, goes to the church one day and climbing upon the altar, gently raps at the tabernacle door and whispers: "Are you there, dear Jesus? Oh, please do answer, for they say you really do dwell here." As there is still no reply, he says to himself: "Perhaps the infant Jesus is sleeping: I will gently wake Him. O sweetest Jesus, I love you, and beg you to answer me." Unable to resist this appeal of childlike love, our Lord replies: "Yes, my little child, I dwell here, to comfort every mourner; what would you ask of me?" (Ibid., p. 203).

If we often visit our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament and remain silently, humbly, and confidently at His feet, we will certainly hear His voice. He will answer us, will console, strengthen, and enlighten us, and His divine words will, according to the expression of Holy Scripture, drop down upon our souls as a refreshing dew. This must literally come to pass, when in need and affliction, especially in the concerns of our souls, we take our refuge to the Blessed Sacrament with faith and confidence. Our Lord expressly promised His assistance in such cases of need: "Come to Me, all you that labor, and are burdened, and I will refresh you".—Matt. xi. 28 (Tabernacle and Purgatory, May, 1905, pp. 10, 11).

Now, in view of what those quotations say, is there then any possible reason why one should not confess

directly to Christ-God in the Eucharist instead of to a priest? For surely it ought to be more consoling, comforting, satisfying and refreshing to repentant sinners to have Christ-God say to them, after they have confessed their sins: "Thy sins are forgiven thee, go in peace" (Luke 7th), or, "go, and now sin no more" (John 8th), than to have a priest in the confessional absolve them in Latin, which they do not understand, and which absolution they accept by faith. And if we cannot confess directly to Christ-God in the Eucharist, as we pray directly to Him, then of what earthly use or benefit is such a Eucharistic abiding present Christ-God to us? He would be of no more use and benefit to us than are the inanimate pagan gods of wood, stone or metal to pagans. So, then, if Christ-God "is always in the Blessed Sacrament;" the Eucharist "secures for us the abiding presence of Christ in our midst;" "His delight is to be with the children of men, to gladden their hearts;" "He is there to see our sorrows more closely, to console us more easily;" He dwells there "to comfort every mourner," and His voice of consolation, forgiveness and assurance "drop down upon our souls as a refreshing dew," etc., etc., then of what use and benefit is all that to the world if He cannot there be confessed to, as He is there prayed to, adored and worshiped, and asked for forgiveness of sin? Think of that question again!

Catholics do not, however, take their grievances, sorrows and troubles to the Eucharistic God for comfort, consolation and relief; for they oftentimes tell them to mere acquaintances and nominal friends, telling them all about their grievances, family troubles and other matters that weigh heavily upon their minds and hearts. That, then, is evidence that the Eucha-

ristic God is not a comforter, consoler and burden-bearer to Catholics, and as useless and profitless to them as the pagan gods, which the Church says, "never give you a word of consolation or hope" (Catholic Ceremonies, Abbé Durand, p. 143), are to the pagans. Does there ever come a "word of consolation or hope" from the Eucharistic God in the tabernacle?

No voice comes from the Tabernacle to stir the hearts of men. The Sacred Host gives no outward token of the Living Presence within. . . . All that our eyes perceive is a round white piece of bread, which faith tells us is the Living God (Tabernacle and Purgatory, August, 1905, p. 37).

Of what more use and benefit, then, than a pagan idol, is a Eucharistic God "in our midst," if we cannot go to Confession to Him, or "no voice comes from it to stir the hearts of men?" None whatever. It not only leads to idolatry and superstition—for Catholics do not look beyond the Eucharist for the original as one does of a picture of a person—and pompous formality, but becomes an actual burden on Catholics, many "of whom are not blessed with much of the world's goods" (Catholic Tribune, April 19, 1906), in building and maintaining magnificent churches and altars as "fitting dwelling places on earth" for such a God.

We have to build Him a house, a tabernacle; to procure precious vessels, otherwise He can not dwell among us (Perpetual Adoration, 1908, p. 8).

The Catholic people today, as ever, gladly spend their hard-earned money that their Lord God might have a fitting dwelling place upon earth (Question-Box Answers, Rev. B. L. Conway, p. 266).

There is one spot on earth which can never be too richly adorned, and that is the sanctuary in which our Lord vouchsafes to dwell among us [Yet cannot go to Confession to Him].

Nothing is too good, nothing too beautiful, nothing too precious for God. He gives us all we possess, and the least we can do in return is to ornament that spot which He has chosen for His abode upon earth (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 362).

Hence the pomp and grandeur of the liturgical rites, the richness of the sacerdotal robes, the splendor of gold, the beauty of precious stones, the fragrance of flowers and of incense (The Real Presence, Rev. Smarius, p. 38).

The exterior of the tabernacle should also be decorated in a manner befitting the presence of the King (Benedictine Parish Monthly, June, 1909, p. 5).

The Church has taken the prophecies in about as literal and material a sense as the Jews did, who believed "the promised Son of David would be a great temporal prince," King, who would sit upon the literal earthly "throne of David His father" (Luke 1:32), as a real earthly king. And it is making material "fitting dwelling places" for God (Although the Bible says that God "dwelleth not in houses or temples made with hands"—Acts 7:48; 17:24), instead of making our hearts, as He wants us to (John 14:23; Apoc. 3:20, etc.), the "fitting dwelling places" for Him, by adorning, ornamenting and decorating them with patience, charity, sobriety, honesty, righteousness, etc. Or like building magnificent palaces and temples so that the photographs or marble statues of a certain person might have "fitting dwelling places upon earth."

Another burden to Catholics, on account of the doctrine of the Real Presence, is that of Perpetual Adoration Societies, mostly in convents, where—

Day and night . . . pious Sisters render Him continual reparation for all the outrages and sacrileges perpetrated against Him in this august Sacrament (Perpetual Adoration, 1903, p. 2).

Here is, in part, what Perpetual Adoration requires:

One pious man, who earns his bread by hard work, considers it a great honor and a particular privilege, to be allowed to place the exposition throne on the high altar (in a new chapel). He will donate $2,000 for this purpose. . . . Holy Church requires that when the Blessed Sacrament is continually exposed (for perpetual adoration), it will take eighty wax candles or twenty pounds of wax, in twenty-four hours. That will make not less than 29,200 wax candles, or 7,300 pounds of wax, in one year, which would cost about $2,555. In this is not included the great feasts, on which about fifty candles should be burned (Ibid., pp. 1, 2).

Yet the old chapel of that very Perpetual Adoration Society was twice struck by lightning within two weeks, so that the two Sisters "who were adorers before the Blessed Sacrament at that hour became almost unconscious from the effects of the shock," and the "entire north wall of the chapel was rent from top to bottom," so that it could no longer be used. That was contained in a circular letter received about five years ago asking for contributions, that a new chapel might be built. About five years later another such letter was received, which contained the following:

The contribution received will go towards the completion and beautifying of our new chapel of Perpetual Adoration, for which we have been soliciting aid during the past years. Our old chapel was so seriously damaged by lightning that we were obliged to build a new one. It is now completed so far, as to enable us to use it for divine service, but the interior is sadly lacking the ornaments befitting the heavenly King whom we adore without intermission, day and night. . . . Our divine Lord in the Tabernacle will not fail to repay you. . . . In return we will remember you day and night in the presence of our Eucharistic God.

The Sisters of that society "have been compelled to borrow about $35,000, in order to be able to provide

the necessary buildings, and for the greater part of this sum of money they must pay 5 per cent., which makes a yearly interest of over $1,500. . . . Surely a heavy burden!" (Perpetual Adoration, 1905, p. 9). The following shows how many Sisters there are in one community of the Perpetual Adoration, for which "necessary buildings" had to be provided, and why there are such societies:

> For more than twenty-five years the ——— Sisters at ——, ———., have kept up the Perpetual Adoration. At present there are more than ninety nuns who have consecrated themselves to this angelic service. . . . In a word, it is sought to render all possible love and adoration to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, remembering His words to Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque: "I have a burning thirst to be honored by men in the Blessed Sacrament." Our Lord likewise said these remarkable words to her: "I wish to be treated as a king in a royal palace". . . . For this purpose we have tried to erect a worthy adoration chapel, and during the past years have received from a number of devout adorers of the Most Holy Eucharist many noble offerings, which have made it possible, to erect a somewhat worthy abode for our Lord (Perpetual Adoration, 1908, p. 7).

But Christ said:

> If any one love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and will make our abode with him (John xiv. 23),

that is, in his heart, which is better than in a material dwelling place, the Tabernacle. Either Christ, then, has changed since He was on earth, or else the revelation purported to have been received from Him, in 1675 A. D., by Blessed Margaret Mary is only a fable. Yet see what a devotion the Church has founded upon that purported revelation. She seems to have forgotten all about Gal. 1:8, which reads as follows:

But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.

Is not Perpetual Adoration "besides," in addition to, "that which" the Apostles preached, if it was not till the year 1675 that Christ made the purported revelation that He had "a burning thirst to be honored by men in the Blessed Sacrament," and wished "to be treated in the Blessed Sacrament as a king in a royal palace" (Perpetual Adoration, 1908, p. 9)?

Here is more as the result of the doctrine of the Real Presence:

A branch of the Nocturnal Adoration Society, which has been in existence for some years in Baltimore, Boston, and other cities, and is affiliated to the parent society at Rome, has recently been established in New York. . . . The first public adoration was held in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, in the church of the fathers of the Blessed Sacrament, . . . when a number of gentlemen relieved each other from hour to hour throughout the night, . . . and at the beginning of each hour, from 10 P. M. until 6 A. M., a party of worshipers replaced those who had spent the previous hour in adoration (Catholic News, February 6, 1904, p. 5).

That the membership is growing, may be seen by the following, which is just three weeks later than the foregoing:

There has been a decided increase in the membership during the past month, and it is hoped that as the devotion becomes more generally known there will be a still greater number of adorers each month (Ibid., February 27, 1904, p. 18).

In February, 1908, a Eucharistic Propaganda was begun, which has for its object the following:

Its aim is to foster fervent and universal devotion to the Blessed Sacrament in a practical and popular way by means of the following devices:

1. The Blessed Sacrament Beads.
2. The Adoration Box with monthly cards.
3. Literature, leaflets and pictures.

The Beads are composed of a medal on which a Spiritual Communion is made [That is, "a desire to receive Jesus in the Eucharist"], and of thirty-three beads on each of which is recited the invocation: "Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, have mercy on us." His excellency, Archbishop Falconio, Apostolic delegate, who has shown the kindliest interest in this pious work, granted an indulgence of forty days each time this invocation was recited; through his gracious intercession with the Holy Father Pius X, the indulgence has recently been increased to 100 days [thus making a new spiritual gift]. . . . The Eucharistic Propaganda also sends out an Adoration Box, so arranged that the time spent by the members of a community or a parish before the Blessed Sacrament may be conveniently recorded, *provided it is offered as adoration*. . . . Postal cards will be furnished on which the hours of adoration and the number of beads distributed should be recorded to be forwarded to the Head Centre. . . . The blessing and the approbations of the highest ecclesiastical authorities are an earnest that the Eucharistic Propaganda will become a powerful instrument for the increase of love towards our Divine Lord in the Eucharist. The work can be adopted in all schools and parishes. Children can be taught to recite the beads in common and to repeat the indulgenced invocation every time the clock strikes. . . . As an incentive to further effort the following report of the work from February 24, 1908, to June 1, 1909, is announced. Local Centres Established 371. Hours of adoration recorded 1,709,933.10. . . . Record for June, 1909, Hours of Adoration 223, 549.10 (Messenger of The Sacred Heart, September, 1909, pp. 561-563).

All that is the result of the Church not paying heed to Gal. 1:8, when a woman, in 1675, is supposed to have received a revelation from our Lord, that He had "a burning thirst to be honored by men in the Blessed Sacrament," and wished "to be treated in the Blessed Sacrament as a king in a royal palace."

Yet His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, says that re-

velation "was complete at the beginning of the Church" (The Faith of Our Fathers, p. 149). And the Church also says:

> If anything is promulgated or definitely decreed by the Church as being part of the faith, the meaning is that this was a thing which the Apostles themselves believed and preached (Plain Facts For Fair Minds, Rev. George M. Searle, p. 59).

Did the Apostles believe and preach that Christ had "a burning thirst to be honored by men in the Blessed Sacrament," and that He wanted "to be treated in the Blessed Sacrament, as a king in a royal palace?" No. The Roman Catholic Church, then, with her doctrine of the Real Presence and devotions of Perpetual Adoration and Nocturnal Adoration, is not the Church of the Apostles, is she? Hardly. And it is strange, too, being that the Church does not permit a woman to teach and preach in the Church, that Christ should have made that purported revelation and gave the instructions to a woman instead of to a man, the Pope, for instance, His supposed infallible Vicar on earth.

And what an astonishing surprise it will be, or ought to be, to those who should ever get their eyes opened to the error of the doctrine of the Real Presence, that the Eucharist, for which they spent "their hard-earned money" for building and maintaining magnificent churches and "richly adorned sanctuaries," as "fitting dwelling places upon earth" for it, and which was the center of "pomp and grandeur of liturgical rites," etc., and which they adored and worshiped in Perpetual and Nocturnal Adorations as God, was after all nothing but an inanimate piece of blessed bread and was not the living, uncreated and eternal God, the "King," as their Church taught them to be-

lieve. Surely, they ought to be surprisingly astonished in that event!

The Church, however, is contradictory in her teachings with regard to the place in which God is, goes to or dwells, as may be seen by the following:

In the Temple he has taken up His abode.

You will invariably find Him there for it is the place of His rest until eternity. . . . He is always in His Sacrament, in His Tabernacle (Sentinel of The Blessed Sacrament, June, 1908, pp. 175, 176).

For love of me, He comes down every day from heaven to earth, bringing me the most precious gifts in the Holy Eucharist (Ibid., August, 1909, p. 259).

In Masses the priest . . . dismisses the faithful with these words: *"Ite Missa est"*, that is to say: "Go now, for Jesus Christ, our one advocate, has left this altar to enter into His glory" (Catholic Ceremonies And Explanations of the Ecclesiastical Year, Rev. Abbë Durand, pp. 62, 63).

Our churches are the tents of the God of the Eucharist. He remains therein perpetually (Ibid., p. 243).

While the priest pronounces the words of consecration, do you contemplate in silence the wonders that pass before you? Your God, your Saviour, and your judge descends on the altar (Ibid., p. 259).

Is there not a contradiction as well as a difficulty in the foregoing? For if Christ-God is in the Tabernacle "until eternity," He remains "perpetually" in our churches, then how does He leave the "altar to enter into His glory?" And if the Temple, the Tabernacle, "is the place of His rest until eternity," then how is He in Heaven to come "down every day from it to earth" to "descend on the altar," the Tabernacle? And if after the Mass the "God of the Eucharist" leaves the altar "whole and entire" to "enter His glory," then to what do Catholics genuflect when they leave the Church after Mass? And if in Mass the priest "feeds

upon the blessed body of Jesus," the "God of the Eucharist," and "consumes" Him, so that His blood flows in the veins of the priest as "the blood of God," then how can that very same "God of the Eucharist" leave the "altar to enter into His glory" in Heaven, or how remain "perpetually" upon the altar, the Tabernacle in the church? Or is there more than one "whole and entire" God? And if He remains "day and night" in the Tabernacle in "the tents of the God of the Eucharist," then how does He, outside of Perpetual and Nocturnal Adoration chapels, spend His nights, alone in churches? Does He gaze at the perpetual light for pastime, or how does He spend his time during the lonely and quiet hours of the night alone in churches?

The Church orders a light to be kept perpetually burning wherever the holy Eucharist is present on an altar, to express her faith in the real presence of Jesus in the holy Eucharist; for which reason a catholic church is really a house of God, not simply a meeting house or a lecture and preaching hall [As she regards Protestant churches]; and a tabernacle is a throne of grace (St. Benedict's Catechism, No. 2, p. 76).

How long and lonely are the nights for Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament! How slowly pass the hours of His abandonment! All is silence in the forsaken church; no human form is prostrate before the Eucharistic God. . . . The sole watcher before the Prisoner of Love is the glowing sanctuary lamp. Lonely indeed are the nights for our Sacramental Guest, but oh! how much more lonely are the days! (Sentinel of the Blessed Sacrament, August, 1909, pp. 250, 251).

The reason He is supposed to be more lonely during the daytime than at night is when people could without much inconvenience go to the church and prostrate themselves before the Eucharist, but which they do not do. Is not the error, idolatry, etc., of the

doctrine of the Real Presence something pitifully awful! We saw that at the *"Ite Missa est"* Christ-God leaves the altar "to enter into His glory" in Heaven; yet here we just saw that He is very "lonely" in church at night. What a contradiction!

If anyone will attempt to find for himself answers to the contradictions and difficulties taught by the Church, he will discover, as I did, that there is no Real Presence of Christ-God in the Eucharist, and before which "a light is kept perpetually burning." And such being the case, there is no Christ-God "lonely" in church buildings, which buildings are sometimes so magnificent in poor communities as to lead a writer, who has traveled quite extensively over the world, to say:

> The lavish waste of wealth so often found in buildings consecrated to a charity-loving Lord by a poverty-stricken community is evidence of the unholy vanity of those who confiscate their victim's savings. Many a poor Catholic village invests a total in its cathedral that would double the home comforts of the entire membership.

That is what results from the doctrine of the Real Presence and making altars, sanctuaries and church buildings, material temples in which "God dwelleth not," instead of our hearts, the "perpetual" and "fitting dwelling places for God," His Spirit.

That there is no Real Presence in the Eucharist, and that there is nothing Supernatural about it, is further proven by the fact that its reception does not prevent or cure sickness, bodily infirmities and diseases. Yet it is claimed Communion will do that, as may be seen by the following:

> Two classes of persons should communicate frequently; the perfect to persevere in perfection, and the imperfect to attain

perfection; the strong not to become weak, and the weak to grow strong; the sick to become cured, and the healthy to prevent sickness.—St. Francis de Sales (The Prodigal Son, Rev. Michael Müller, p. 479).

Do not all Clerics "communicate frequently" when they say Mass daily and communicate at each one? Why is it then that there are quite a few sick and ailing Clerics, some of whom die quite young, or who consult specialists, go to mineral springs, change climates, etc., in search of health? Or why is it that they ever became afflicted, if frequent Communion "prevents sickness?" Nor are they the only ones that are afflicted and suffer from sickness, but even quite a few good, pious Sisters, who "communicate frequently," are sick, consumptive or are otherwise afflicted, die young or seek health in various ways. Or why did they also ever become sick and ailing?

Besides, the Church teaches the following:

Whatever we ask at this time (Communion) will surely be given us, on condition that it is not contrary to the will of God and our salvation.—St. Teresa (Perpetual Adoration, 1905, p. 8).

God is not accustomed to pay in a niggardly way for the sojourn that He has made in the stopping-place of our heart, after He has had a reception therein.—St. Teresa (Messenger of The Sacred Heart, January, 1909, p. 26).

He is with you (at Communion) to do whatever you wish (The Sentinel of the Blessed Sacrament, June 1908, p. 178).

Now if when a communicant has supposedly Christ-God in his heart, He will give "whatever he asks" that "is not contrary to the will of God" and He does not then "pay in a niggardly way," and He will give "whatever you wish," then should not ailing and afflicted Clerics, Sisters and Catholic laymen ask for restoration to health? And if they do, and they are

not restored to health, then does that not make it evident that there is no Real Presence and that the Eucharist is not Supernatural, but that it is only as so much blessed bread? Yes. For it cannot reasonably be said that it is God's will they should be sick and ailing and some die young, when they are doing so much good in the world. And if it is God's will that they should be sick and ailing, or it is not His will that they should be restored to health, then why do they use medicines and employ every human agency to get well or to prolong their suffering lives here? Why fight God's will, or trample it under foot, by trying to get well after He would not give them health when they asked for it at Communion? Or did they all make unworthy Communions?

St. Paul, in these words (1 Cor. 11:30), says: On account of your unworthy communions, because you, in many instances, receive without discerning the body of the Lord, you are afflicted with sickness, and even with death, in punishment of your awful guilt by the profanation of the sacred body and blood of the Redeemer (Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. S. Keenan, pp. 214, 215).

The reason they are sick and afflicted, or were not restored to health, is not because they might have made "unworthy Communions," but because there is no Real Presence in the Eucharist, and nothing Supernatural about it.

That there is nothing Supernatural and animating about the Eucharist, may further be seen by the following:

Notwithstanding all attempts to check it (lack of communicating when attending Mass), coldness in this respect went on increasing from day to day and from year to year until the Church found it necessary to enact laws requiring all to approach Holy

Communion at least on Sundays and festivals. In course of time still greater latitude was given, for it was only required that a person should communicate at three special periods of the year, viz., on Christmas, Easter Sunday, and Pentecost. . . . This practice continued until about the thirteenth century, when the fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, held under the auspices of Pope Innocent III., solemnly declared and decreed, under pain of excommunication, that all the faithful who had reached the years of discretion should confess their sins at least once a year and approach Holy Communion within the Pascal time (A History of The Mass, Rev. John O'Brien, A M., pp. 371, 372).

(Were those "Thus saith the Lord" [The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 144] laws or decrees? If so, why were they changed if God is unchangeable?)

The Church enjoins, under pain of mortal sin, a single communion in the year, as the least which can be required of a Christian (The Prodigal Son, Rev. Michael Müller, p. 474).

Does it appear from the foregoing as though the following are true?

The soul's insatiable hunger increasing the more, the oftener it eats of this mysterious Bread giving a foretaste of heavenly delights (Sentinel of the Blessed Sacrament, January, 1908, p. 25).

When the Lord, in holy communion, enters our soul, does not enter with Him heaven with all its delights and felicity? (Tabernacle and Purgatory, November, 1906, p. 101)?

The more my soul was satiated with this Heavenly Manna, the more ardently it hungered for it.—A humble workwoman in France (Children of Mary: Frequent and Daily Communion, Father Julius Lintelo, S. J., p. 51).

In urging you, dear reader, to the more frequent use of this Sacrament, these words of Holy Scripture are to the point: "Taste and see that the Lord is sweet." You need but make an earnest trial and you will soon experience that there is a mag-

netism about the Blessed Sacrament, which draws you to it (Benedictine Parish Monthly, December, 1909, p. 6).

God, having constituted Himself man's last end, placed within man's breast a craving for union with Himself; and hence He must needs grant man what He made it natural for him to crave for. . . . Ardent love cannot bear separation, and it wants the conscious presence of the object loved (Truth, March, 1908, pp. 277 278).

The body and blood of Christ being distributed in our members, we become Christophori, that is, we carry Christ with us (Truth, April, 1908, p. 7).

When "coldness in this respect (of going to Communion) went on increasing from year to year," so that the Church had to "enact laws requiring the faithful," "under pain of excommunication and mortal sin," to "at least once a year approach Holy Communion," does that make it appear to be true, that "the oftener the soul eats of this mysterious bread" its "insatiable hunger increases the more" for it; that "when the Lord in Holy Communion enters our soul," with Him enters "heaven with all its delights and felicity;" that "there is a magnetism about the Blessed Sacrament, which draws one to it," and that God has "placed within a man's breast a craving for union with Himself" in the Eucharist, and that one has so an "ardent love" for the Eucharistic God that one "can not bear separation" from it, or make it appear there is anything warm, thrilling, animating, impelling, attractive or magnetic about it? The answer is too evident not to know what it is.

Again, if by receiving Communion we have "union with" God, we feel "the conscious presence of the object loved"—but which is not the case, for no one feels a warmth or thrill immediately after having received Communion, and if one did feel thus it would be a

"new miracle" (Truth, February, 1908, p. 265)—and "we carry Christ with us," then does all that last only, as we saw, till "the natural heat has destroyed" the "species," or till they have "ceased because of digestion," "which will only be for a few minutes at most?" If so, then does such a short "union with" God, once a month or quarterly or yearly, at the "Pascal time," when He takes His leave again "whole and entire," really do the people any good? The "increasing depravity of morals," the "corruption of morals," "graft," etc., as we saw, when the "religion of all Europe was Catholic" and there were no Protestants to criticise conduct, is the answer, is it not?

Of course, that is not to be wondered at if Christ is present in the Eucharist "after the manner of something inanimate."

> To be inanimate is to lack a *soul,* the principle of life. To be "after the manner of something inanimate," is to fail to give some of the indications of animation, or the possession of a soul. . . . By saying that Christ is present in the Eucharist, after the manner of something inanimate, we mean, then, that He is present in such a *manner,* that without a new miracle He can not give any indication of His living presence. . . . For any indication of animation given by Christ in the Eucharist would be a *new miracle* (Truth, February, 1908, p. 265).

To be present "after the manner of something inanimate," then, is the same as to be present "after the manner of something dead," lacking "a soul, the principle of life." Well, such a Christ is just as useless and worthless to us as is the "inanimate" pagan god of wood or stone to the pagan, is it not? And it is not giving very much spiritual "life to the world," as Christ said "the bread of God," the "bread of life," would give, is it, if there was an "increasing depravity

of morals," etc., when the "religion of all Europe was Catholic," and the Church had to "enact laws requiring the faithful," "under pain of excommunication and mortal sin," to "approach" Communion at least once a year? Surely, all that makes it very evident that a Christ present "after the manner of something inanimate" is useless and worthless to the world, and that to eat the flesh of such a Christ indeed "profiteth nothing." And to go to Communion, then, only "under pain of mortal sin," is simply a mechanical observance or compliance with a law of the Church, and is not in response to a free and spontaneous "hunger and thirst" for or a "craving within man's breast for union with God." And there is not received in Communion, "in a wonderful manner, spirit, grace, and life, in its very fountain," is there, when we judge by the fruits of the times when the "religion of all Europe was Catholic?" "By their fruits you shall know them," which are the proofs that a Christ, who is present in the Eucharist, "after the manner of something inanimate," is absolutely useless and worthless to the world, and absolutely "profiteth nothing" to those who eat such Eucharistic Christs. And it is no wonder, then, that the Church had to enact laws from time to time obliging the faithful to approach Communion at stated times, and that man has not in his breast "a natural craving for union with" such a Christ-God.

If a man really had in his breast a "craving for union with" the Eucharistic God, then there would be no need of enacting a law obliging him to unite himself with this God, or go into His presence in the Tabernacle in church, just as a young man having in his "breast a craving for union" in marriage with a certain attractive and magnetic young woman needs

no law obliging him to call on her, or compelling him to unite himself with her in marriage.

In view of that, then, does not the Church law of yearly Communion flatly contradict the claims of the Church that God has placed in man's breast "a natural craving for union with Himself," and if this union is to be had only by eating the Eucharist? Yes. It also further proves that there is nothing Supernatural, animating, impelling, attractive or magnetic about the Eucharist, and that to eat it does a person no more spiritually good than if one were to eat at a dining table a piece of blessed bread or an oyster cracker.

The law of yearly Communion is like the law of the Church that obliges the faithful, "under pain of mortal sin" (Question-Box Answers, Rev. B. L. Conway, p. 455), to go to Mass on Sundays and holy days. Protestants not knowing of that law wonder what sort of a magnet the Mass is that it can draw Catholics in large numbers to church and fill their churches in the early hours of the forenoon, when many Protestants are still in bed, and when their churches are often but scantily filled. It is mainly so because a law of their church obliges them to go; that is the reason for it. Yet despite that law the attendance at Mass is not what it ought to be.

Is not the neglect of Sunday Mass and of Easter Communion one of the most saddening signs of the times, . . . and a great obstacle to the propagation of the faith? (Sentinel of The Blessed Sacrament, August, 1908, p. 247)?

(Yet the Church says, as we saw, that Mass and Communion are magnets, "which draw us to them.")

How prevalent are the sins of drunkenness, cursing, swearing, . . . and neglect of Mass on Sundays (Spiritual Pepper and Salt, Right Rev. Wm. Stang, D. D., p. 190).

Well, probably the Sunday "Mass-missers" are beginning to reason with themselves in this wise, and saying:

If we can, by going to Confession, when we make our Easter Duty, get forgiven the mortal sins of "drunkenness, cursing, swearing", etc., that we regularly commit again and again, we can also at the same time, by confessing them, get our mortal sins of missing Mass on Sundays forgiven.

The Vesper services of the Church, to which her members are not obliged, "under pain of mortal sin," to attend, are very poorly attended, excepting on Sundays during Lent, in comparison with the attendance at Mass. Yet they are quite important, for they usually end with the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, where Christ is supposed to bless those present the same as those were blessed who were personally blessed by Him while He was on earth. But enough of that. Here is the why of the law of yearly Communion:

The motive of the Commandment of the Church is a desire on the part of the Church to prevent neglect of a necessary means of salvation. Mindful, therefore, of the words of Jesus (Here quotes John vi. 54, 55), she lays upon us her fourth Commandment "To receive the Blessed Sacrament at least once a year",—and that at Easter or thereabouts (Essentials and Non-Essentials of the Catholic Religion, Rev. H. G. Hughes, pp. 88, 89).

With a latitude of three months, it is hard to see how the Easter obligation should be a burden to any one. The fact is, it is not for want of time or opportunity that people put off the discharge of this duty; but they have simply grown so unspiritual, so thoroughly worldly, that it requires a superhuman effort to get themselves into the proper condition. There are those who live well-nigh heathenish lives for 364 days of the year, and it is little wonder they should find it hard to live as a

good Christian for twenty-four hours (Benedictine Parish Monthly, March, 1909, p. 2).

It would seem that if any "live well-nigh heathenish lives for 364 days of the year," it would not matter much if they did "neglect a necessary means of salvation," that of a yearly Communion, which made them "live as a good Christian for 24 hours." For if they should die suddenly or be killed in an accident 48 hours after their "good Christian life of 24 hours," they would be without salvation anyway. So, then, of what use is a yearly Communion by law, and then live the remainder of the 364 days of the year "a well-nigh heathenish life?" And do such abide in Christ, and He in them (John 6:57)? And do such "thirst" (John 7:37; Apoc. 22:17)? It would seem that such would need to be "born again," rather than be compelled by law to perform a certain yearly "religious duty." But what else can be expected if Christ is present in the Eucharist, "after the manner of something inanimate."

CHAPTER VII.

When one has so little love and thirst for the "living God," "after the manner of something inanimate," that he will not spontaneously "feed upon His blessed body," but must be made to do so by law, by which—

> No man is justified with God (Gal. 3:11),

such a one is not at heart much of a disciple of Christ, is he, although he is a member of the "only saving faith," as the Church claims she is? And is not the law of yearly Communion contrary to the doctrine of salvation by free will, and contrary to what Christ and the Apostles taught, who used "persuasion" (Cor. 5:11)? Christ said:

> If any man thirst, let him come to me, and drink (John vii. 37). And he that thirsteth, let him come; and he that will, let him take of the water of life, freely (Apoc. xxii. 17).

Is that not, in one sense, persuasion? If so, then when one is obliged by law to go to Communion at least once a year and eat and drink Christ literally, and one goes only because one is obliged by law to go, then can it be said such a one has any thirst for Christ, or that one has in his breast "a natural craving for union with" Him in the Eucharist, or that one has a free will, or that his Christianity is spontaneous, of the "born again" kind? Hardly. If a man is not thirsty for natural water and he is made to drink by compulsion, law, then has he a free will? No. In view of that, then, the law of yearly Communion, supposed to be "a necessary means of salvation," is un-

scriptural, contrary to the teachings of Christ and contrary to the doctrine of salvation by free will, is it not? Yes. And when one desires salvation and has hunger and thirst for Christ, or "a craving for union with Him," so that he wants to "feed upon His blessed body," "take the water of life, freely," and have "the blood of God flow in his veins," then he will not wait until he is obliged by law to go to Communion. And whenever he wants to go to Communion, or wants to go frequently, then it is not a matter for his "confessor" to judge for him and give his consent when to go or how often, as is now the case in the Church.

The Pope has rendered a decision on the practice of frequent Communion, which is to be made known to all bishops and all superiors of religious communities. It is substantially as follows: "Frequent, and even daily, communion is to be strongly commended, and the only condition requisite for its profitable reception by all classes of the faithful is freedom from mortal sin and the resolve to avoid sin in the future. The confessor will be the judge in the case. His consent is required" (Catholic Tribune, April 19, 1906, p. 7).

That makes one's "confessor," not one's own heart, disposition and inclination, the "judge in the case." Surely an anomaly!

The Church has the following to say about "frequent, and even daily, Communion:"

The holy martyr Cyprian, writing on the Our Father, says: "We ask daily in the Lord's Prayer for this Divine Bread, that we, as we daily receive the food of salvation, may live united with Christ, and by the assistance of His grace, be preserved from all vices" (Tabernacle and Purgatory, August, 1905, p. 46).

In this holy Mystery, our Redeemer places at our disposal all the benefits of His Passion and Death, that we, who daily commit sin, may be daily washed in His precious Blood [What

need, then, of going to Confession?], and daily nourished by the reception of His sacred Body.—St. Bernard (*Ibid.*, p. 48).

We pray that our daily Bread, which is Christ, may be given to us daily.—St. Syprian (Ibid., September, 1908, p. 72).

Pray that the "Sacred Congregation" will give us permission to receive it daily or frequently?

The question of how frequently a person should go to Holy Communion and what dispositions are required for the frequent reception of the Holy Eucharist has often worried pious Catholics. The Sacred Congregation has lately settled it definitely (St. Benedict's Calendar, June, 1906, p. 50).

Christ said that "if any man thirst, let him come to me, and drink," "let him take the water of life, freely" (John 7:37; Apoc. 22:17). Does then the "Sacred Congregation" precede or supercede Christ, because "pious Catholics" are to be governed by its decisions, and not by their own "thirst," "natural craving," for Christ, as to "how frequently they should go to Communion?" Do not such compliances with the decisions of the "Sacred Congregations" result only in religious formalities, mechanical piety?

You shall receive Me in holy communion as often as obedience shall permit you; you shall moreover communicate on the first Friday of each month.—Our Lord to Blessed Margaret Alacoque, at "that last great revelation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which took place during the octave of Corpus Christi, June 16, 1675" (Tabernacle and Purgatory, February, 1906, pp. 104, 106).

That contradicts what Christ, our Lord, said in John 7:37; Apoc. 22:17. Has Christ changed? The Church says this about "revelation:"

All revelation came from God alone through His inspired ministers and it was complete at the beginning of the Church (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 149).

What, then, was "that last great revelation" purported to have been received by, or made to, Blessed Margaret Alacoque in June, 1675? Was it what St. Paul would call it (Gal. 1:8)? And is not the Sacred Heart doctrine, with its Communions on the "first Friday of each month," something "besides," that is, an addition to, that which the Apostles preached? And if women, according to God's Word, as the Church claims, are not to teach and preach in the Church, then it is very strange indeed that our Lord did not make "that last great revelation" to a man, the Pope, for instance, instead of to a woman. What an inconsistent and self-contradictory Church the Roman Catholic is. Is that not a fact, in view of what we have seen?

If you keep away from Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, you will lose your tastes for heavenly things, while acquiring, alas! the taste for evil pleasures [Are "evil pleasures" eaten and tasted with the mouth?]. It will then be too late to accustom yourself to frequent Communion. Therefore, with the permission of your Confessor, go to Jesus as often as possible (Children of Mary: Frequent and Daily Communion, Father Lintelo, S. J., pp. 40, 41).

That would be like, "with the permission of your Confessor," praying to God "as often as possible." What an absurdity, this regulation of getting the "permission of your Confessor" to go to Communion "as often as possible!"

To me it seems a person should go to Communion whenever he has in his breast "a craving for union with" the Eucharistic God, regardless of what the "Confessor" has to say about going "as often as possible," and regardless of whether it is the "first Friday of each month," or on Sunday, Monday or Thursday, or any other day. Is that not so?

But here the Confessor seems no longer to have

a "corner" on Communions, that is, on how often one may "feel upon the blessed body of Jesus," God, if he has "a craving for union with Him" and wants the "blood of God" to "flow in his veins:"

Even the priest no longer has the power to economize the grant of Communions at discretion, once a penitent receives in a state of grace [As though he could ever receive in any other state, without bringing "judgment to himself"] and out of some right motive. . . . His permission is not essentially needed, for the Holy See (the Chair of Peter) has itself done much more than permit the practice; it positively urges it. Thus the Confessor is warned "not to dissuade anyone" who receives in the state of grace and out of a right motive [Wants to "take of the water of life, freely?"]. In view then of the priest's position in the business as defined by Rome [*Ex Cathedra?*], it would be a curious case of "topsy-turvy-dom" for a parent calmly to forbid that which the priest himself is warned by the Holy See to beware of forbidding.—Rev. F. D. Zulueta, S. J., on "Parents and Frequent Communion of Children" (Messenger of The Sacred Heart, June, 1909, p. 339).

The Council of Trent expressly lays it down that Christ desires the Holy Eucharist to be received as "a remedy for daily faults." The Fathers teach the same doctrine. Because you sin every day" ["Chase Christ away by sin and enthrone Satan in his place" daily?], says St. Augustine, "receive Communion daily". . . . And St. Ambrose, his great contemporary, teaches that "this daily bread is taken as a remedy for daily infirmity," . . . that is, for venial sin (Messenger of The Sacred Heart, December, 1908, p. 718).

Are there not a lot of contradictions and inconsistencies, and much "topsy-turvy-dom," in the quotations of the last few pages on "frequent, and even daily," Communion? Once it is, in the Lord's Prayer the daily bread asked for is supposed to be divine bread, the Eucharist, and means we should receive it daily in order to "be preserved from all vices." Then, we should get the "permission of the Confessor" should

we want to comply with the petition in the Lord's Prayer and want to go to Communion daily, or go "often to Jesus" to "feed upon His blessed body." Yet Christ also said we should "take of the water of life, freely," should we "thirst" for it. Then, we should go to Communion "as often as obedience shall permit," and "on the first Friday of each month," as though the petition "give us this day our daily bread," was more applicable on the "first Friday of each month" than on the other days of the month. And this regulation or exhortation a woman received in a revelation in 1675, although revelation was supposed to have been "complete at the beginning of the Church," which it appears was not the Roman Catholic Church. For she has many doctrines and devotions that were "revealed" to saints in the deserts and other places of solitary seclusion, in the Middle Ages, when the "religion of all Europe" was Catholic.

The language used by Christ in those purported revelations sounds so different from that which He used while on earth, as recorded in the Bible, that in reading those revelations it becomes apparent at once that they were not from Him at all, but were the fabrications of those who wanted to promote certain doctrines and devotions. They are like the "revelations" the head officers of certain churches purport receiving from God, when they want their sons to be chosen their successors at their death, or want to promote anything in their churches. But enough of that.

Again, frequent or daily Communion would imply that the body and blood of Christ, the "flesh of God" (Messenger of The Sacred Heart, April, 1909, p. 210), the Catholics' food for the soul, is no more substantial,

imperishable, lasting and eternal than the animal flesh and natural food for the body, of which a healthy person partakes daily. That fact alone is enough to prove there is no Real Presence of Christ-God in the Eucharist. For surely the real "flesh of God" ought to be as substantial, imperishable and eternal as God Himself, the "I AM," whose divine essence, substance, is certainly substantial, imperishable and eternal. Such being the case, then there is no need of partaking "frequently, and even daily," of the "flesh of God" unless one "chases Him away by sin and enthrones Satan in His place," or else one eats and "consumes" only the "appearances" and not the real "flesh of God." And if the latter, then how has one "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drank His blood?"

If a person would only think for a moment and understood that the substance, essence, of God is eternal and imperishable, which would make His flesh also the same, he would see the great error of the Church that one should often or daily literally eat the "flesh of God," in order to "nourish and sustain his soul," just as one partakes daily of natural food to nourish and sustain the body. And the only time, then, for going to Communion would be after one had "chased Him away by sin," though it be but half an hour or so after one had previously communicated. And, if in wanting to eat the "flesh of God" so soon again, the confessor should make objections then the aspirant for Communion could say about this to him:

Father Confessor, I just chased Christ-God away by sin. I just cannot bear separation from Him and I have in my breast an intense craving for union with Him. Therefore I went to Confession again and have come to the Communion railing to

receive again Christ-God into my soul; for he is not there just now.

That is a sentence one could legitimately form from the contradictory teachings and practices of the Church. But how absurd that is! It is only when one "digs a little deeper" into them that one can see their absurd, contradictory, inconsistent and unscriptural character, and see there is no Real Presence in the Eucharist, that it is only as so much blessed bread or wine, as quite a few Catholics are beginning to regard it, and that the Spirit must be received "by the hearing of faith" (Gal. 3:2) and believing (John 7:39), mental acts of the mind and will, and not mouth-eating acts.

The Catholics who do not believe in a Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, when they go to Communion they do so to specially remember the death of the Lord, "until He come," and do not communicate with the thought as though they were eating the "flesh of God," in order to "have everlasting life." There are quite a few Catholics of that kind, but, of course, they do not make that known to anyone who might tell the Church about them. But to me they have told it because they know I will never give them away to the Church, or to anyone who might betray them to the Church. And the reason they do not leave the Church is because they can not expediently do so. Some have died since, who told me at one time they did not believe all the Church teaches, and they were buried from the Church, and with a Mass, too.

The following is what the Church has to say about what a Catholic must believe in order to be a member of her fold:

Should a Catholic be so unfortunate as contumaciously to deny a single article of faith . . . he ceases to be a member of the Church (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 27).

A Catholic must accept all the teachings of the Church or must reject them all. There is no picking or choosing as to the doctrines you will believe in. You must accept it as a whole or reject it as a whole (Catholic Register, August 19, 1904).

Yet there are more people members of the Church than she has apparently any idea of, who deny more than "a single article of faith," who do not "accept it as a whole," and who disbelieve this or that doctrine or doctrines. And one of them is the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, they regarding the Eucharist as simply a piece of blessed bread, in the partaking of which they hold the thought of specially remembering the death of the Lord, "until He come," for which the Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ. The Eucharist to such, then, is not Supernatural, but is only as so much blessed bread. Yet they live lives "of a high moral standard."

But be that as it may, the Eucharist, then, being only as so much blessed bread, and it instead of the gospel and the spirit and life of Christ being made by the Church the "bread of life," is it any wonder, then, that "coldness in this respect (of going to Communion) went on increasing from day to day and from year to year until the Church found it necessary to enact laws" obliging all, "under pain of excommunication and mortal sin," to receive Communion "at least once a year;" that there should have been an "increasing depravity of morals" in the thirteenth century, the "graft" and the "corruption of morals" in the sixteenth century, which, as we saw, "called

for a sweeping reformation," when practically the "religion of all Europe" was Catholic? No. And does all that not make it very evident there is nothing of a supernatural character about the Eucharist, that the Spirit must be received "by the hearing of faith," and that "the letter (John 6:48-59) killeth, but the spirit quickeneth" (2 Cor. 3:6)? For surely to receive the Eucharist is to "co-operate with it, or at least is not resisting it" (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 303); just as to eat natural food is to "co-operate with it, or at least is not resisting it," the one believed to work supernaturally in the soul to supposedly strengthen and animate it for the practice of heavenly virtues, and the other working naturally in the body to strengthen and sustain its life for the performance of earthly labors. Is that not so? Yes.

But now it may be said that if one has not the will to "practice heavenly virtues" then the soul strengthened by Communion can not practice them; just as a body strengthened by natural food can not "perform earthly labors" if it does not will to work. Granting that such is the case, then does that not prove that the will is not animated, moved and impelled by the reception of Communion, as well as by attendance at Mass, to "practice heavenly virtues?" Yes. Neither does natural food animate and impel the will, that it may, through the body, "perform earthly labors." For oftentimes the strongest bodied and the most well-fed people have the least will and inclination to labor.

In view of that, then, it is not Communion that makes or impels us to practice heavenly virtues, but that it is the will that does, and that the will is not

moved, animated or impelled by Communion or by attendance at Mass.

That the will and inclination to do right, practice heavenly virtues, are not strengthened, animated or impelled by the reception of Communion and attendance at Mass, may be inferred from the following:

> In the earliest ages the Church imposed great penances upon sinners for their sins which were already forgiven. For instance, murder or adultery was punished by a penance of twenty years; perjury, eleven; fornication, denial of faith or fortune-telling, by seven years of severe penance with fasting, etc. During this time it was not allowed to travel, except on foot, to be present at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, or to receive the holy Eucharist. If the penitents showed a great zeal for penance and sincere amendment, . . . the bishops granted them an indulgence, that is, they remitted the remaining punishment either totally or partially (Goffine, Rev. Leonard Goffine, p. 553).

If, then, penitents in the earlier ages of the Church could persevere for years or for twenty years in "sincere amendment," that is, without recommiting the same kind of sins, when they were "not allowed to be present at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, or to receive the holy Eucharist," then does that not prove that the Mass and the Eucharist are not supernatural, there is nothing animating or sanctifying about them, that they do not move, impel and strengthen the will and inclination to do right and do not "preserve from mortal sin," nor "subdue our passions," nor "repress" them, when those who made use of the Mass and Communion, in their "passions," committed "murder and adultery?" Yes. "By their fruits you shall know them."

We just saw that the Church at one time "imposed great penances upon sinners for their sins which were already forgiven." Yet notwithstanding that severity

there was an "increasing depravity of morals" and the "corruption of morals" became so prevalent and great "as to call for a sweeping reformation," when the "religion of all Europe" was Catholic. That is another proof that a Christ present in the Eucharist, "after the manner of something inanimate," is absolutely useless and worthless, and that with such a Christ and the great severity of penances and Church laws and inhibitions, people can not be made to and will not "live lives of a high moral standard," and shows that the "spirit that quickeneth" is not received by a mouth-eating act, "works of the law" (Gal. 3:2), but must be received "by the hearing of faith."

When Christ was on earth and forgave sinners He did not then impose "great penances upon" them, but said to them: "Go in peace" (Luke 7:50); "Go, and now sin no more" (John 8:11), etc. Yet the Church says:

> Priests impose a penance on the sinner (in the Confessional), as Jesus would do, if He were still on earth (Questions Asked by Protestants Briefly Answered by a Priest of the Diocese of Buffalo, p. 37).

As Christ did not impose penances when He was on earth it is not likely He would do so now, "if He were still on earth." Such being the case, the Roman Catholic Church can not be and is not the "only and true Church of Christ," is she? But be that as it may, that there is no Real Presence in the Eucharist may still further be seen by the following:

> In order that there may be no danger of the Sacred Particles becoming stale or unpleasant to the taste, it is customary to renew them every eight or ten days (A History of The Mass, Rev. John O'Brien, A. M., p. 88).
>
> The Church further teaches that the Real Presence of Christ

remains as long as the form remains uncorrupted; when, however, that becomes changed—as, for instance, if the taste of the consecrated wine should become sour, so that it would no longer be considered as wine but as vinegar—the Real Presence would no longer remain (Plain Facts for Fair Minds, Rev. George M. Searle, pp. 84, 95).

How does the Church know such is the case? Where does it say that in the writings of the Apostles or in their creed? Does the living chicken, which has been made from the changed substance of an egg, become "stale in eight or ten days," or become sour, spoiled, even though "the shell of the egg remains after its substance has been changed into the living chicken" (Truth, April, 1908, p. 6), unless it is killed or becomes inanimate? No. If, then, the substances of bread and wine, that have supposedly been changed into the living Christ, and, as we saw, "no bread or wine whatsoever remain after the consecration," they having been "annihilated" at the consecration, become "stale," "sour," then they have really never been changed into the living Christ, have they? No; unless a "new miracle" takes place, that is, retransubstantiation, which, it might then be asked, Who or what performs that miracle? Is it chemicalization, fermentation or Christ? For the substances of bread and wine are supposed to be no longer present after the consecration, so that the "species" are no longer to be beheld as bread and wine, and it is their substance, not their "appearances," that become stale and sour, just as we no longer behold "the shell of the egg" that remains after its substance has been changed into a living chicken as the "veil" of the living chicken. In fact, so long as the shell is not broken we can not

know whether the egg contains a living chicken or rotten matter. Besides, the Church says:

> Every object in creation is made up of these two elements (substance and accidents). By the substance we mean a thing's very essence. By the accidents we mean its mere qualities. . . . Substance, therefore, is that which stands under or supports the qualities perceived by our senses; that which lies behind the phenomena; that, in a word, in which the attributes and accidents of a thing may reside. The accidents, on the other hand, are the mere qualities inherent in the substance; that which the substance supports; those external appearances or evidences by which the existence of the substance is recognized and made known to us (Thoughts For all Times, Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan, pp. 139, 140).

If, then, substance "is that which stands under or supports the qualities perceived by our senses," and our sense of taste perceives a stale and a vinegar taste in the "accidents" of bread and wine, and it is these external evidences of a stale and a sour taste "by which the existence of the substance is recognized and made known to us," the substance that "lies behind the phenomena," or "species," then when the "species" become stale and sour, through the natural laws of acidity, decay or fermentation, does that not prove that no "substance" of the flesh and blood of Christ-God ever laid behind the "accidents" of bread and wine that become stale and sour in "eight or ten days?" For surely the superior substance of Christ-God ought not to be subject to the operation of the inferior natural laws of decay, acidity or fermentation. For it is the substance "which lies behind" the "accidents" that becomes stale and sour. The "accidents" to all outward appearances have practically remained the same, the change having taken place in the "substances." And Christ-God's presence in them should

preserve them from becoming stale and sour, just like certain preparations preserve fruits, meats and other perishable matter, when applied to them. In view of that, then, if the Eucharist can become stale and sour in "eight or ten days," then is that not another proof that it is not Supernatural and does not contain the Real Presence, but is only as so much blessed bread and wine; just as the dragon of the pagan god could not be a god, because the prophet Daniel gave it something to eat that killed it? For the pagans had sense enough to believe that anything that could die could not be a god. Well, it is the same with the substances of consecrated bread and wine, if they become stale and sour at any time, then they do not and never did contain the substance of Christ-God "whole and entire," or His flesh and blood. Is that not so?

The further fact that Communion wine creates in some clerics an abnormal appetite for liquor, so that they become slaves to "wine and women," the two generally going together, shows that the substance of consecrated wine never was changed into the blood of Christ. For surely the blood of Christ ought to be a stronger alkaloid, or whatever it might be called, on the heart and soul of man than the mere "appearances," substanceless matter, of wine and ought to counteract its stimulating and intoxicating nature and taste, so that it really should and would transform persons of normal, or even of passionate, natures and fiber and heredity into total abstainers, or to crave only for those things for which Christ had a liking and aspiration, instead of the wine transforming them into "slaves of sensuality," as it does quite a few clerics. For it is supposed that "like begets like."

And if it will not do that, then of what earthly use and good is a Eucharistic Christ-God received in Communion? So, then, if Communion wine creates in some clerics of normal, or even of passionate, natures, who were the former and were moderate users of liquors at their ordination, an abnormal appetite for liquor, then is that not a proof the consecrated wine does not contain the blood of Christ? Yes. For in Communion or by it, it is supposed Christ's—

> Soul compenetrates and transforms our souls, so that, as the Apostle words it, "it is now no longer we that live, but Christ liveth in us" (The Sacramental Life of the Church, Rev. B. J. Otten, S. J., p. 119).

And surely Christ does not "live" in those who overload themselves with liquor when the temptation to do so presents itself. There is no Real Presence of Christ-God in the Eucharist, then, is there, if Communion wine creates in some clerics an abnormal appetite for liquor? No. And if there is none in Communion wine then there is also none in Communion bread. The Eucharist, then, does not contain the Real Presence, does it? Hardly.

We have now seen in various ways, in the preceding pages of this work, that there is no Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and that the doctrine must therefore be an error, etc. Such being the case, then was not the discovery that the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence is an error, etc., in itself a sufficient reason for my becoming a non-Catholic and leaving the Church, even without taking into consideration other errors she teaches?

And as the Eucharist is, as we saw, the Church's most important doctrine in the whole of Catholic theology," her "central dogma," where "all the dogmas

of her holy faith come to a focus," "the very soul of the Church" and the "keystone of Catholic worship and center of religious faith," then it is inevitable that with the undermining of the doctrine other doctrines based upon it must necessarily fall with it. And that they do. I will give a few instances to show that such is the case.

1. That of the Mass, of which the Real Presence of Christ in bread and wine is indispensable and necessary—

> In order to represent the actual separation of the blood from the body which took place on Calvary (What the Church Teaches, Rev. Edwin Drury, p. 251).

Thus, without a Real Presence, removing from the Mass its supposed sacrificial and expiatory phases, and making it only a make-believe, a formal ceremony, a sham, which it really is if—

> Since the resurrection of Christ, His body is impassible, and His blood can no longer be really separated from His flesh (The Real Presence, Rev. C. F. Smarius, S. J. p. 33),

and for which Catholics give to clerics "stipends" of from one to five or more dollars each, every time they want a Mass said for a special intention or purpose, that being the charges made for a Mass of one kind or another.

> The Bishop has laid it down, as a general rule for all, that the stipend for a Low Mass shall be one dollar, and for a High Mass, five dollars (Stories for Catholic Children, Rev. A. M. Grussi, p. 130).
>
> A priest is only bound to offer Mass for a special intention when this honorary ["stipend"] is paid (The Correct Thing for Catholics, Lelia H. Bugg, p. 84).

A Low Mass is one where there is no singing by

the priest. A High Mass is one where there is singing by the priest and a choir. A Solemn High Mass is one where there are three priests at the altar and where there is singing by both priests and choir. The "stipend" for such a Mass is usually five dollars for each priest. A Pontifical High Mass is one that is celebrated by a Bishop, Archbishop, or some cleric in orders higher than a priest, who has an indefinite number of clerics to assist him, and where there is singing.

Such masses are said usually only on the great feast days of the Church, as Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and where there is any special Church celebration, etc. Such Masses are not "stipended" so far as I know or have heard. In fact, I have never heard of any one ever having such a one said for a special intention.

Stipended Masses for special intentions or purposes are usually said for the following purposes: (a) For an indefinite time for the repose of the souls of departed relatives, friends, or others, who are supposed to be in purgatory—not in hell, for the Church does not teach that any one there can be prayed or Massed out of it—suffering in a fire that—

> The greatest earthly fire in comparison with the fire of purgatory, can be called nothing else than a delightful garden of pleasure.—St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi's visions of purgatory (Perpetual Adoration, 1902, p. 13).

Suffering in order to—

> Satisfy the justice of God for sins already forgiven (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 247).

Which souls the Church says cry out and appeal to us by saying: "Have pity on me, at least you, my friends, for the hand of the Lord hath touched me,"

which supposed appeal induces their living relatives and friends on earth to become generous with stipends and "have a good number of Masses said" for them, so that God may free them from purgatory "so much the sooner and take them to heaven," thus showing that the ones in purgatory who have the more generous and wealthy relatives and friends on earth will get out of it sooner than those whose relatives and friends are poorer and ungenerous.

The following two voices are supposed to be from purgatory:

Oh, pity me, poor soul! I am nearly altogether deserted. Condemned to suffer such torments, and for so long a time. . . . . My body they put into a rich coffin; . . . but for my soul they will do nothing or hardly anything! The Mass on the funeral day, and two or three Masses afterwards, is all they have given me. . . . Ah, me! I am almost forgotten! Have pity on me, at least you, my friends, for the hand of the Lord hath touched me!" [The other voice says]: God be praised! How happy am I! I was also condemned for many years [although I received a Plenary Indulgence on my death-bed]; but my time is shortened. . . . A few days more and I shall be released! God bless them (relatives and friends). . . . With a true spirit of love and sacrifice, they are having a good number of Masses said for me. God has been pleased to accept their good will: I will be freed so much the sooner! Only a few more Masses, so my guardian angel tells me, and the good God will take me to heaven (Stories for Catholic Children, Rev. A. M. Grussi, pp. 128, 129).

And in the Church—

Mass is our chief action upon purgatory (All for Jesus, Father Faber, p. 403).

Mass not only shortens their pains, but also extends great immediate relief to these poor souls. . . . At every Mass many issue from purgatory and fly to holy paradise (The Hidden Treasure; or, The Value and Excellence of the Holy Mass, St. Leonard of Port Maurice, p. 89).

In the Church—

A Plenary Indulgence exempts the sinner completely from purgatory (A Popular Manual of the Grand Jubilee of 1901, Rev. Joseph Jackman, C. SS. R., p. 20).

If one were to die immediately after really obtaining a plenary indulgence, he would go straight to heaven (The Catholic Register, October 14, 1904).

A plenary indulgence is usually given by the Church to a sick person, in danger of death, when he receives on his deathbed the "last rites" of the Church. So, then, if any Catholic goes to purgatory after a death for which he was prepared by the Church by her "last rites," and the Church would have us believe that about every Catholic will go to purgatory, then of what use was the plenary indulgence the person in danger of death by sickness was given by the Church when she gave him the "last rites?" Only another inconsistency and contradiction on the part of the Church, is it not?

I just stated that the Church would have us believe that about every Catholic goes to purgatory after death. Well, it seems such is the case according to the following:

Shortly after the saint had another vision. The venerable Pope Innocent III died just at the close of the Lateran Council. Luitgardis saw his soul enveloped in flames. Greatly astonished, she asked: "How is it that thou, such a great and perfect Pope, our Father and model, must endure such cruel chastisement?" . . . But I must still suffer, suffer till the end of time, if thou dost not assist me by thy prayers (Tabernacle and Purgatory, November, 1906, p. 125).

When the renowned John of Loewen died, the Carthusians prayed with such fervor for the repose of his soul, although the holy life he had led gave hope that he hardly stood in need of such assistance. He was a faithful defender of justice and a

zealous preacher of the holy Gospel. His life was blameless, his morals severe. Besides, he had always preferred the good of others to his own personal advantage. He had charitably assisted many religious orders, and among them the Carthusians of Roermond, whose abbey had often received considerable alms at his hands. . . . *But even this holy and generous man did not escape the pains of purgatory* (Ibid., November, 1907, p. 124).

If, then, a "great and perfect Pope," and a "holy and generous man," "did not escape the pains of purgatory," will not about every Catholic go to purgatory after death, to "wash their robes," souls, there, instead of cleansing them here "in the blood of the Lamb" (Apoc. 22: 14)?

That it makes no difference how long it has been since one departed this life, or what one's life and character in the estimation of the Church might have been, for whom a Mass will be said if a stipend is paid for it, may be seen by the following:

Widow Gaffney succeeded in keeping herself honestly and respectably on what she earned by office cleaning, and watching sick people at night. She lived in a diminutive trianglar room, opening directly into the lane, with a tiny staircase in one corner, leading up to a similar room overhead, which was occupied by a lodger, a good, quiet girl, who worked in the town. One morning after Mass she came into the sacristy and said: "Father, would it be any harm to pray for Henry the Eighth?" "No, my child. He was a very bad man, but that is no reason for not praying for him." "Well, and could your Reverence say a Mass for him?" "Oh, yes; only it would hardly do to read his name out among the rest." "Ah, then," said she, as she put the stipend in my hand, "I wish you would, for I have been thinking may be the poor fellow has nobody to help him." Widow Gaffney was an Irishwoman, and therefore not likely to have much natural sympathy with Henry the Eighth. He had not only become unconscious, but had died ages ago. But who can tell? Bad as he was, might he not, even in the throes

of death, have repented, and been saved at any rate from hell? (Truth, December, 1904, p. 245).

(b) Masses are said for restoration to health, although they did not restore me to health when my people a few years ago, and when I was yet a Catholic in mind and heart, had some said for that purpose. And it seems Masses do not help sick and ailing Clerics and Sisters, either; for just see the number of them who die quite young, or who linger long and who travel from place to place, and from clime to clime, with the hope of regaining their lost health, or of prolonging their lives here.

"By their fruits you shall know them."

(c) For calling down God's blessings on the fruits of the earth, although when there are late frosts that damage fruits and vegetables, or there is a severe drouth, or a hail storm, or crop-destroying insects are at work in any locality, or hog cholera comes into a neighborhood, the fruits, vegetables, growing crops and hogs of Catholics suffer and die the same as those of their adjoining non-Catholic neighbors.

(d) At marriages, so that God might specially bless those united in holy wedlock, although some of the unhappiest of marriages, full of misfortunes, that I know of personally, were solemnized with a Mass of one kind or another. While some of the happiest of marriages, full of fortune, that I know of, are those of Protestants, which certainly were solemnized without Masses; all of which proves, if "by their fruits you shall know them" is a truism, that there is absolutely nothing much but error, etc., attached to or about Masses. Is that not quite evidently so?

There are other "special intentions" for which stipended Masses are said, but those mentioned are the

principal ones, and so I will not mention any more of them.

Now back to where we digressed, where it was being shown what doctrines fall with the undermining of the doctrine of the Real Presence.

2. That of indulgences, one of which is the following:

> May 18, 1907, the Church granted an indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines to all the faithful who look with faith, devotion and love at the Sacred Host at the moment of elevation (in Mass), and say at the same time the words, "My Lord and my God!" The same indulgence is granted also at other times whenever the Sacred Host is solemnly exposed on the altar [as at Forty Hour Devotions, etc.], and we fulfil the same conditions. Persons who practice this devotion daily can gain a plenary indulgence once every week, if, in addition they also receive Holy Communion (Benedictine Parish Monthly, November, 1907, p. 7).

If, then, the Sacred Host is really not God, so that one can not truthfully say when looking at it, "My Lord and my God!" as children do in a body at Parochial school Masses, for instance, then is not an indulgence based on the Real Presence of God in the Eucharist undermined, and becomes the same as nothing? Among other indulgences that are thereby undermined are the Plenary Indulgences of the Sacred Heart Fridays, the first Friday of every month in the year, the Forty Hour Devotion Indulgences, and all Indulgences in which the reception of Communion is one of the "conditions."

An indulgence does *not* mean a license to sin, as many non-Catholics have been taught or been led to believe, neither does it have to be paid for, but means the following:

An Indulgence is simply a remission in whole (Plenary Indulgence) or in part (Partial Indulgence), through the superabundant merits of Jesus Christ and His saints, of the temporal punishment due to God on account of sin, after the guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 428).

That makes it appear as though the Church had a monopoly or "corner" on the "superabundant merits of Jesus Christ," and that they are not as free as air and sunshine, and that she has the prerogative of dispensing them or doling them out, and that they can not be freely appropriated, as air and sunshine, by each individual at will, "through faith in His blood" (Rom. 3:25).

3. That of Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament, making it the same as though it were made with an empty Monstrance, or with a picture of Christ, or with a piece of simply blessed bread. Such a Benediction, then, would be nothing more than a make-believe, etc., and it makes the display of many lighted candles—

On the altar, unreasonable, unnecessary and meaningless (Reasonableness of Catholic Ceremonies and Practices, Rev. J. J. Burke, p. 32).

4. That of the supposed supernatural Communion with the Eucharist, thus reducing it to a level with, if not beneath, the comprehensible and Scriptural Communion of the "Protestant bodies," which observe the ordinance to show "the death of the Lord, until He come," with the use of simply blessed bread and wine, as Christ and His disciples did at the Last Supper. And can one not specially remember another at his banquet without eating him, like specially remembering George Washington at a banquet in honor of his

birthday, where he is not eaten? Yes. Well, it is the same with specially remembering Christ at His banquet, the Lord's Supper, without eating and drinking Him, notwithstanding that the Church says that there must be a "manducation of Christ's real body and blood" (The Protesting Christian, Rev. J. Perry, p. 57) in order to specially remember Him and "show forth His death." By the words, "if not beneath," it is meant in the sense that the Protestant Communion is a more complete memorial than Catholic Communion, because Protestants use, as Christ and the Apostles did, both bread and wine, thus making it a more complete memorial than is the Catholic Communion with bread alone.

5. That of the Infallibility of the Pope, etc., etc. For the following certainly is a manifest error, in view of what we have seen:

> He alone is able to fulfill the duties of a Christian life who has put on Christ, and Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table. . . . Given at Rome, in St. Peter's, this tenth day of January, nineteen hundred, the twenty-second year of our Pontificate, Leo XIII, Pope (Catholic News, April 4, 1900).

Was that a "Thus saith the Lord" (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 144)? For the Church teaches that when the Pope or the Church declares anything it is a "Thus saith the Lord," or "The voice of the Church is the voice of God" (The Prodigal Son, Rev. Michael Müller, p. 343). If Christ, as we saw, is not really present and inherent in "whole and entire" in the Eucharist, and the Spirit must be received "by the hearing of faith" (Gal. 3:2), then is it not manifest that to teach *ex cathedra* that "Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the

Eucharistic table" is an error? And if an error then it is not an infallible utterance, and if not an infallible utterance then the voicer of it can not be infallible. And does not that, then, prove that the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope is an error? Yes.

St. Paul said:

> For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have *put on Christ* (Gal. 3:27).

That is quite different from that which the late Pope said, is it not? Yes. And if Christ is "put on" by being "baptized in Christ," then by the "frequentation of the Eucharistic table" is not the only way to "put on Christ," is it? No. Pope Leo XIII., then, erred, did he not, when he said that "Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table?" Notice, he did not say: "Christ is *also* put on by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table." Had he said that then it would have been different. But when he said what he did, then he made a fallible "thus saith the Lord" *ex cathedra* utterance, did he not? Yes. The Pope, then, is not infallible, is he? No, most manifestly not.

St. Paul also said:

> This only would I learn of you; Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are you so foolish, that whereas you began in the Spirit, you would now be made perfect by the flesh? (Gal. 3:2, 3).

From that it may be inferred that he did not teach the Galatians that Christ was "not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table," but that He, His Spirit, was put on, received, "by the hearing of faith," that is, a mental act of the mind and will, not a mouth-eating act, "by the works of the law,"

going to Communion, as in the Church now. And the fact that the Church at different times passed laws obliging her members, "under pain of mortal sin," to "approach Holy Communion at least on Sundays and festivals," then later, on Christmas, Easter Sunday and Pentecost," and, finally, in 1215, "at least once a year," makes it evident that during the time of St. Paul they received "the Spirit, by the hearing of faith" and not by external or carnal rites, the Catholic Sacraments, the "frequentation of the Eucharistic table." And it is no wonder, then, they had no laws in his day obliging one to go to Communion in order to "put on Christ," "receive the Spirit," and that those laws of the Church were not made from the beginning of Christ's Church. It was only after the Roman branch of the Christian Church reached the ascendency, and began to interpret the sixth chapter of St. John in the literal sense, which gave greater unction to the "sacerdotal dignity" of her clerics, if they could "out of a piece of bread" make "a God," and the method of receiving the Spirit was changed from that of "by the hearing of faith" to that of the "frequentation of the Eucharistic table," that it became necessary to "enact laws requiring all to approach Holy Communion" at stated times, receive into the mouth the "inanimate" Christ supposed to be in the Eucharist. The enacting of those laws is another self-evident proof that the Roman Catholic Church is not the Church of the days of St. Paul. For if it was, then in his day and in the early Church they should have had those laws, if the Church of Christ was to be unchangeable, and Christ gave a—

Full and complete system of laws, to operate through all coming time (The Path which Led a Protestant, etc., P. H. Burnett, Rev. Jas. Sullivan, S. J., Ed., p. 46).

But as He did not give those laws, as well as the law of attending Mass on Sundays and holy days, at the founding of His Church, and they were added in later times, and as in the days of St. Paul the Spirit was received "by the hearing of faith," not "by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table," makes it very evident that the Roman Catholic Church is not the "true and only Church of Christ," nor the Church He established, nor the Church of St. Paul's day. Christ, unless He is not omniscient, would have foreseen that a time would come that the people would no longer spontaneously go to Communion and to Mass on Sundays, and would be obliged to be made to go by law, and He would have given at the founding of His Church those laws, "to operate through all coming time," had He regarded the Lord's Supper as a Eucharistic sacrifice. To say that He did not or could not foresee these conditions, and therefore could not have enacted such laws, "to operate through all coming time," would be the same as saying He was not omniscient and could not know or foresee what the future would produce. In view of that, then, do not the laws obliging the faithful to "approach Holy Communion at least once a year," and to attend Mass on Sundays and holy days, "under pain of mortal sin and excommunication," prove that the Roman Catholic Church is not the Church Christ established, nor is the Church of St. Paul's day?

But be that as it may, St. Paul said further:

> If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His (Rom. 8:9).
>
> They that are Christ's, have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences (Gal. 5:24).

That is quite different from that of eating in Com-

munion a piece of blessed bread, frequenting the Eucharistic table, and believe by so doing one has "put on Christ," or has "crucified the flesh," has the Spirit of Christ and is His, fulfilling the "duties of a Christian life," and "keeping His commandments," as many do in the following way:

Were a stranger to pass through the city at the season of Lent, were he to see the churches so well filled, and the confessionals so well crowded with penitents, what a good opinion he would form of the Catholics here. Wherever we turn we behold eyes filled with tears, countenances stamped with contrition—everywhere signs of sincere devotion. Here truly, he would say, Jesus is honored; here He rejoices, here He celebrates a glorious triumph. Yes; but return here in two months, in two weeks, even, and the penitent faces will be seen at parties, balls, theatres, frolics, in drinking saloons; at the gambling table the very same hands; in families, among relatives and neighbors, the very same quarrels; in the stores the same false weights, the same fraud; the old curses and blasphemies will be heard in the streets and public places. This is indeed a change of scene, and this change of scene is renewed every Easter (The Prodigal Son, Rev. Michael Muller, p. 297).

(At Easter is the time, as we saw, that all are obliged to "approach Holy Communion," "put on Christ.")

Do we acknowledge that Grace is a priceless treasure, without parallel or equal in the whole of creation? Well, I distinguish. With our lips we do, and with our intellects, too; but only in theory; in practice we do not. Indeed any one considering our lives and studying our aims, aspirations, ambitions and desires, would regard us as a set of the most inveterate liars that ever lived; and might unhesitatingly describe us, one and all, as miserable impostors and contemptible hypocrites, who say one thing but mean exactly the opposite. For how is it possible (they would argue) that men can honestly believe Grace to be the treasure they say it is, while, at the same time, they make no appreciable effort to retain possession of it, or,

if already possessed, to increase it—while, in fact, they are more ready and eager to labour, toil, and suffer for anything whatsoever rather than for it. Indeed, the hope of wealth, or honor, or fame, can stir them up to far greater enthusiasm, and set their hearts in a far greater blaze, than the hope of any increase of this supernatural treasure. . . . Our faith is sound; yes, but oh! how dead and cold and wanting in power and influence. . . . In a word, inconsistency marks our lives, is the badge of all our tribe, and extends to almost everything supernatural (Thoughts for All Times, Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan, pp. 316-319).

Well, if "Christ is present after the manner of something inanimate," after the manner of something dead, "without the principle of life," and leaves again "whole and entire" as soon as the "species" have "ceased because of digestion," which is "about fifteen minutes after receiving," then the foregoing is not to be wondered at, is it? No. For no thrill and warmth and spirit are felt when receiving Communion, such as is felt "by the hearing of faith," truth, or by hearing a sacred hymn that is understood. How often the few summing up words of sermons, such as, "Live the White Life," "Don't be so Small," etc.. thrill and impress one so much that their force and remembrance lingers and influences one's life for untold number of days. But no such force, thrill or impression is received by the reception of an "inanimate" Christ in Communion. For many Catholics receive Communion on Sunday morning, and in the evening go to the theater, airdome or moving picture show; and certainly that is an "inconsistency" that shows "how dead, and cold, and wanting in power and influence" is the reception in Communion of a Christ who is "present after the manner of something inanimate." And were it not for the fear of criticism

of their conduct by Protestants, Catholics would now live about the same kind of lives the Catholics did when "the religion of all Europe was Catholic," did they depend on the inanimate Christ in the Eucharist, received in Communion, to thrill, animate, actuate, impel and move their spiritual will and conduct and life.

Again, is that having "put on Christ," or "growing in grace" (2 Pet. 3:18), to renew the "scene two weeks after Easter," when one is obliged, "under pain of mortal sin and excommunication," to go to Communion? And if no one is "able to fulfill the duties of a Christian life" who has not frequented the Eucharistic table, then are no Catholic children under twelve years of age, who are not permitted to frequent "the Eucharistic table," and no Protestants fulfilling "the duties of a Christian life?" No one will hardly dare say there are none. If, then, some Catholic children under twelve years of age, and some Protestants, do "fulfill the duties of a Christian life,," does that point alone not prove the non-infallibility of the utterance and teachings in question of the late Pope, Leo. XIII.? If so, then is not the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope an error?

Of course, it may be said that what Pope Leo XIII. said may not have been exactly or strictly an *ex cathedra* utterance, and, therefore, it makes no difference whether it is strictly true or not. But such a reply will not hold good in view of the following:

> When the Church speaks, even when she does not speak with all the weight of her infallible utterance, she does invariably give us *safe guidance* (Essentials and Non-essentials of the Catholic Religion, Rev. H. G. Hughes, p. 31).

Is it "safe guidance" to say:

He alone is able to fulfill the duties of a Christian life who has put on Christ, and Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table,

when children under twelve years of age, and Protestants, who do not "frequent the Eucharistic table," can and do "fulfill the duties of a Christian life" and live "lives of a high moral standard" (Catholic Belief, Rev. J. F. Bruno, p. 160)? Answer for yourself. Was it "safe guidance" in Galileo's case, when now we know that Galileo was right?

Again, to renew the former scene of sin "two weeks" after having received Communion, be it at the Paschal time or not, is that growing in grace, or make it appear as though Communion is the "most powerful antidote against a relapse into sin," and "maketh virgin those hearts inclined to evil?" Hardly. For if it were, then every Catholic in every age should have lived and should live a life "of a high moral standard." That is another proof, then, is it not, that there is no Real Presence in the Eucharist, and that it is not supernatural, when "two weeks" after its reception one renews the former "scene" of sin? Yes. Nor have such "put on Christ," have they, notwithstanding what the late Pope Leo XIII. said? No. He was then in error, was he not in what he said? Yes.

CHAPTER VIII.

What does it mean to "put on Christ?" Does it not mean to have His spirit and life, be Christ-like in character, "grow like Him in tastes, in temper and in character?" Yes. Well, did Christ get drunk periodically or ever? No. Those, then, who frequent the Eucharistic table and still get drunk periodically, have really not "put on Christ," have they? No. Did He use profane language? No. Those, then, who "frequent the Eucharistic table" and still continue to use profane language, have not "put on Christ," have they? No. Was He quarrelsome, jealous, envious, greedy, impatient, haughty, a grumbler, a tease, a "smarty," a "tough," etc.? No. Those, then, who frequent the Eucharistic table regularly and who still are quarrelsome, jealous, envious, impatient, proud, who still grumble, etc., and who can not get along in "charity, joy and peace" (Gal. 5:22) with their relatives and others, have not "put on Christ," have they? No. Did he hate the negro, or any other race? No. Those, then, who frequent the Eucharist table and still hate, despise or abuse the poor negro, who can not help that God made him a negro instead of a white man, have not "put on Christ," have they? No. All such have simply partaken of a piece of blessed bread, the Eucharist, have they not, notwithstanding what Pope Leo XIII. said and taught *ex cathedra?* Yes. The late Pope, then, was not infallible, was he? No. And no Pope, then, is infallible, is he? No.

Neither is the present Pope Pius X. infallible. For he is called "the Pope of the Holy Eucharist" (Benedictine Parish Monthly, December, 1909, p. 5). And as the doctrine of the Eucharist is an error, anyone urging and exhorting the "frequent and even daily" reception of the Eucharist, as Pius X. is, can not be infallible.

The Church teaches the following:

He [Communicant] must be fasting, at least from midnight; for so the Church commands, agreeable to a most ancient and apostolical tradition [1 Cor. 11: says differently]. So that if through inadvertence a person has taken anything, though it were no more than one drop or crumb, after twelve o'clock at night, he must by no means receive (Communion) that day; it would be a crime to attempt it (The Catholic Christian Instructed in The Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies, etc., Most Rev. Dr. Challoner, p. 100).

By putting that teaching of the Church and that of the late Pope Leo XIII. together, then one who had "after twelve o'clock at night" inadvertently taken anything into the mouth and swallowed it, could not on that day "put on Christ," and to attempt to do so, through receiving Communion, "would be a crime." Think of it! Just because one should inadvertently take a crumb of bread or cake or a drop of water or a swallow of water, as was the case with a candidate for First Communion at the time I made my First Communion, one could not on that day, as he could not, "put on Christ." For without the reception of Communion, as Pope Leo XIII. taught, "Christ is not put on," and one could then not "fulfill the duties of a Christian life," when I suppose one would for that day be able to live only a "well-nigh heathenish life." But do you believe that on account of thoughtlessly taking anything into the mouth and swallowing it, after midnight, one can not on that day "put on Christ"

through the mind and will, or "fulfill the duties of a Christian life"? No. That, then, shows plainly the erroneousness of the teaching of Pope Leo XIII. and of the Church, does it not? For it is certainly an error, an absurdity and contrary to the fact and premise that one must through the mind and will put on, if one wants to, the spirit, life and character of another, to believe one can not for the day really and truly "put on Christ" simply because one has inadvertently or intentionally taken a swallow of water or a drop or a crumb after midnight. Is that not so? The Pope, then, was not infallible, was he? For surely one can through the mind and will "put on Christ" even if one has just not only taken a drop or a crumb, but a "square" and sober meal.

Such being the case, then, any Pope who teaches that "Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table," as the late Pope Leo XIII. taught, is not infallible, is he?

Again, why should one not take anything "after twelve o'clock at night" of the day one intends to go to Communion, unless Christ-God really goes with the Eucharist into one's stomach, so that it should be free of anything that is polluting? And if it be said the reason the Church commands fasting after twelve o'clock at night is that otherwise some might appear at the Communion railing in an intoxicated condition, which was the main reason for the making of that command, then it seems that if anyone can not drink intoxicating liquor after midnight of the day he intends to go to Communion, without getting drunk, he is not worthy any way to partake of the Lord's Supper. Is that not so? For one who would get drunk before receiving Communion, if he were allowed the use of liquor after midnight, is no better than the one who gets drunk after

Communion on the day he goes to Communion—neither one of whom would be worthy to partake of the Lord's Supper—the condition into which some must get if "women and WINE are usually at the bottom of such deplorable downfalls" (Catholic Register, 1908).

In either event, then, whether fasting or not after midnight, Christ-God would go into one's stomach at Communion, if there were a Real Presence in the Eucharist, would He not? Then think of His being "objectively present," a "concrete reality," in one's stomach! Shocking is such a thought, is it not? And if He does not stay in one's stomach, but makes His way from the stomach to the heart, without the medium of a Host, then why can He not also make His way into one's heart, or take possession of it, as the Blessed Virgin does, as we saw, at any time one wants Him to, asks Him to, without the medium of a Eucharist? Think of that again and it may open your eyes to the erroneous teachings of the Church with regard to the Real Presence and Communion, and that a Pope who teaches that "Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table," can not possibly be infallible. And if such a Pope is not infallible, then no Pope is, is he?

I will here state for the benefit of those who do not know what is the real and true meaning of the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope, or who may have gotten a wrong idea of it through reading works written by "ex-priests" or "escaped nuns," what it really means. It means the following:

That the Pope can not err when teaching a doctrine of faith or morals to the whole church (St. Benedict's Catechism No. ii, p. 41).

The Pope, as successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, by virtue of the promises of Jesus Christ, is preserved from

error of judgment when he promulgates to the Church a decision on faith or morals. The Pope, therefore, be it known, is not the maker of the divine law; he is only its expounder. He is not the author of revelation, but only its interpreter (The Faith of our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 149).

That is the true and only meaning of the Infallibility of the Pope, he being supposedly incapable of erring when he expounds "the divine law," "promulgates to the Church a decision" on how to "put on Christ," and interprets revelation, just as the Supreme Court of the United States is supposed to render an infallible and irrevocable decision when it decides a point of law or interprets the Constitution of the United States, and as the High Priests of the old law when they interpreted the prophecies pertaining to "the promised Son of David," saying He "would be a great temporal prince." That is all that the doctrine means and it does not mean or include the Pope's supposed inability to sin as claimed by some so-called "escaped nuns"—as though convents were enclosed by a twenty-foot stonewall, with locked iron gates—or "ex-priests," as may be seen by the following:

Catholicism teaches that the Pope of Rome is infallible and can not sin, neither can he make a mistake (A Certain Book, by an "Ex-Priest").

The same book also contains the following:

Catholics are assured that by paying a few dollars into the coffers of the priest they can have their sins pardoned. . . . The followers of Catholicism are taught that by the payment of a few dimes they can have their sins remitted and pardoned; thus you will see that crime has no terrors for such a class, as they believe that when they have committed a crime all they have to do is to go to the priestcraft and have their

sins pardoned in exchange for perhaps a part of the money which they gained in their criminal transaction. . . . A Roman Catholic can swear, break the Sabbath, dishonor his parents, lie, steal, commit adultery, get drunk and commit any other crime that he chooses, provided that he returns to the confessional box and pays for having his sins pardoned.

Now, the claims that the Pope "can not sin," that a Catholic can commit any "crime that he chooses" and that he can get it pardoned "by paying a few dollars (or any other sum), into the coffers of the priest," in the "confessional box," or anywhere else, are, if the writer is really an "ex-priest," not merely untruths, but lies, plain, bare-faced lies! For he knows, if he ever was a Catholic priest, or even only a layman, that the Church, or "Catholicism," teaches nothing of the kind. He knows that the Church teaches that—

The Pope is not impeccable; on the contrary, any Pope may fall into sin (Catholic Belief, Rev. J. F. Bruno, p. 71), and that he confesses his sins every week (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 147).

And, of course, to "confess every week" implies newly committed sins to confess. He knows that instead of "the followers of Catholicism" being taught they can go to "the priestcraft and have their sins pardoned in exchange for perhaps a part of the money which they gained in their criminal transaction," they are taught that in order to obtain absolution, "pardon," they must make restitution and—

Restore ill-gotten goods, or to make compensation for wrong done to your neighbor when it is in your power to do so (Catholic Belief, p. 303). That he is obliged to have a firm purpose of amendment, to promise restitution, if he has defrauded his neighbor, to repair any injury done his neighbor's character (The Faith of Our Fathers, p. 414).

Now, in view of the foregoing, and that a lie is to tell something as being true when one knows positively that it is not true, while an untruth is to tell something as being true when one does not positively know it is not true, then are not the foregoing assertions of an "ex-priest" not merely untruths, but lies? Plain lies? Bare-faced lies!

His book abounds with misrepresentations of Catholic teachings and practices, and is filled up mainly with narratives of the supposed immoralities and licentiousness of the "priestcraft" and of nuns in convents, all of which are nothing but sensational lies and unsavory rot! Books of that kind, instead of turning fair-minded people against the Church, which seems to be his main object, or converting Catholics to Protestantism, really only tend to turn them towards it and to convert them to Catholicity, or to make her lukewarm members more firm and active in their faith. For after non-Catholics read a book of that kind they will usually want to investigate for themselves to see if the Church really teaches and practices such "abominations," and if her clerics and nuns are as immoral and licentious as the book claims, and when they find those claims to be untrue, which they are, as a rule, they will usually become Catholics if they are in any way religiously inclined and are not members, or not very firm members, of any church, thus producing the opposite result of that which the book presumably was intended to accomplish.

So, then, after this when you read a sensational book, full of the supposed "abominations" the Church teaches and practices, and of narratives of the supposed immoralities and debaucheries of the "priestcraft" and nuns, written by a so-called "ex-priest," or

"escaped nun," then read and digest its contents with a big grain of salt or doubt of its truthfulness, even though its writer claims to be willing and is—

> Qualified to go before not only any official who has the power to administer an oath and to make oath to the truthfulness of every assertion made herein, but I am willing to meet my God around the great white throne in heaven [which I do not believe he will ever see, unless he repents of his lies and makes reparation for them] and stand upon the declarations herein contained (Book by an Ex-Priest).

We have now seen what is meant by the Infallibility of the Pope, and that it does not mean he "can not sin," but that he can not err when "teaching a doctrine of faith or morals to the whole Church." But by what we have seen, the Pope can err and has erred in teaching.

But now it may be said, as some Catholics have said to me, because I claimed that Popes could err and have erred, as the Jewish high priests could and did, and that the Church over which the Popes had been placed could err and was teaching some errors, that—

> If the Church has erred, then Christ has lied; for He said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;"

or to say that she erred would be to "deny, at least implicitly, the Divinity of Christ" (An Hour With a Sincere Protestant, Rev. J. M. Schleuter, S. J., p. 5).

Because Christ said "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" His Church, does that mean that no one of the "teaching body of the Church," from the Pope down to the lowest Cleric, could possibly teach a single error or errors? By no means does it mean that. But

it means that persecutions, physical or otherwise, the teachings resting on visions and revelations of Saints since the days of Christ and the Apostles, which are the bases, and the only bases, of many of the teachings of the Church, as, for instances, the Scapular of the special protection of the Blessed Virgin, the Rosary, the Sacred Heart promise of "final penitence" and Communion on the "first Friday of each month," etc., and the laws and commandments of men, should not supplant and destroy, and be "besides," His teachings, or Church. That is what is really meant by "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" His Church. And with regard to the claim, to say the Church fell into error, would be to "deny the Divinity of Christ;" the Jewish Church could also say, to say she erred with regard to the prophecies pertaining to the "promised Son of David," and her attitude towards Christ, would be to "deny, at least implicity, the very existence of God, who made our High-Priest and the teaching body of our Church infallible" (Annotation to Deut. 17:8; Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. Keenan, pp. 369, 370).

It may be said further:

> If the Church fell into error and corruption in the course of time, then the gates of hell prevailed against her. . . . Moreover, in sending His Apostles into the whole world to teach and baptize, to guide and to command, He said: "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the end of the world." Here He solemnly pledges His word that He would abide with His Church always. How could the Church become corrupted with the abiding presence of Christ? (Spiritual Pepper and Salt, Right Rev. Wm. Stang, D. D., p. 111).

How could Popes, Clerics and laymen sin, become guilty of Church "graft," "depravity of morals," "most

corrupt lives," as we saw, with "the abiding presence of Christ," even in "concrete reality," and when it says He—

> Is able to preserve you without sin, and to present you spotless before the presence of his glory (Jude i. 24)?

And how could the Jewish Church fall "into error and corruption in the course of time," with the abiding presence of God, so that she failed to see in Christ the long "promised Son of David," and be accused by Him of being "blind guides" (Matt. 23:24)? Yet the Jewish Church is regarded by the Catholic Church as having been infallible and was preserved from error, as we will see later.

Again, if Christ would "abide with His Church always" in a Eucharist, as we saw the Church says He would, and from which "no voice ever comes," then how can such an "inanimate," voiceless Eucharistic Christ prevent the Church, which disregarded Gal. 1:8, and made the purported revelations received by isolated Saints during the centuries following the days of Christ and the Apostles the bases of some of her teachings, practices and devotions, from falling into error and idolatry? And why did not the "always abiding with the Church" Eucharistic Christ-God tell the Church to pay no attention to the purported revelations received by Margaret Mary and others who claimed to have received certain revelations, which the Church has made the bases of some of her teachings, etc., and of which the Apostles said not a word?

A Christ present, "after the manner of something inanimate," cannot preserve the Church from falling into error and idolatry. And it is to the Eucharistic

Christ that the Church looks to for her Christ, as may be seen by the following:

> Without the Holy Eucharist, the world would be empty, the temple of God desolate, the soul cold, the heart lonely. Were the Saviour not present in His adorable Sacrament, where would we find Him? In His Holy Scriptures, but in these He speaks from afar. . . . Our contemplation of how He is in heaven would but give us hope; we can not live upon meditation and hope alone. For that reason Jesus Christ has instituted the wonder of love, the Holy Eucharist (Sentinel of The Blessed Sacrament, April, 1909, p. 126).

The Church, then, may fall "into error and corruption in the course of time," if she expects and looks to "the Saviour present in His adorable Sacrament," the Eucharist, from which "no voice ever comes," to preserve her from falling into error and idolatry, or "corruption," and yet the "gates of hell" NOT have "prevailed against" His teachings, or Church; for they are yet to be found in the Scriptures. For to "prevail," in one sense, means to predominate, obtain, succeed, overthrow, destroy. And that is no doubt what Christ meant when He said that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" His Church, and not that no one or no church, which heeded revelations made since the "beginning of the Church," and disregarded Gal. 1:8, could teach a single error or errors.

It may also be asked, as Clerics have asked those who talked with them about my claims that the Pope and Church erred:

> Why should I, an ignorant and illiterate person, know better than did the great minds of the Church, as, for instances, St. Thomas, St. Jerome, etc., and I be right and they should have been wrong?

No doubt that was about the way the High-Priest,

the supposed infallible head of the Jewish Church (The Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 118, 119); the Scribes and Pharisees, the "great minds" of the Jewish Church, who were also regarded as "infallible teachers" (Doctrinal Catechism, pp. 369, 370), queried about those whom they regarded as "ignorant and illiterate," because such believed in Christ while the "great minds" of the Jewish Church did not. The following would indicate that such might have been the case:

> They (Scribes and Pharisees) answered and said to him: Thou wast wholly born in sins, *and dost thou teach us?* And they cast him out (John 9:34).
>
> Now seeing the constancy of Peter and of John, understanding that they were *illiterate and ignorant men,* they (high priest and others) wondered; and they knew that they had been with Jesus (Acts 4:13).

By paraphrasing that a little, the Church would about say the following to me, because I am "ignorant and illiterate:"

> Thou are wholly ignorant and illiterate, and dost thou teach us; that is, the Pope and the teaching body of the Church? What presumption!

Now, did the "great minds" of the Jewish Church, who rejected Christ as the "promised Son of David," "know better" than did the once blind man, who "wast wholly born in sin," and the "illiterate and ignorant" Peter and John, because the latter believed in Christ as being the "promised Son of David?" No. Persons, then, of "great minds," superior intellect, eminent learning, church position and "authority" are not always right and the "ignorant and illiterate" always wrong, are they? No, not by a good deal. Nor were the "great minds" of the Church, and early Church Fathers

(The Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 339, 340), who believed in and taught the Real Presence, any more infallible teachers than was Pope Leo XIII., who said that "Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table." Nor were they any more infallible than were the Jewish Church Fathers from the 15th to the 1st centuries B. C., who taught that the "promised Son of David would be a great temporal prince." Nor are "the mural decorations of the Catacombs," which are supposed to be "full of the doctrine of the Eucharist" (The Church and The Catacombs, P. F. C. Costelloe, M. A., p. 16), infallible silent voices or witnesses that make the doctrine true. Nor did the practice of the primitive Christians of burying a Host with the dead, make the doctrine true.

A venerable author of an ancient life of St. Basil tells us that the illustrious Pontiff, after having celebrated the holy mysteries, divided the Host into three parts, consumed the first with great respect, reserved the second to be deposited in his tomb, and placed the third in a golden dove which suspended over the altar (Sentinel of The Blessed Sacrament, January, 1908, p. 15).

So great was the faith of the primitive Christians in the virtue of the Holy Eucharist that, not content with giving it to the living, they also placed it in the grave with the dead, in order that it might be a safeguard against the wiles of the devil, and as a companion for that body which had been through life, in virtue of the participation of the sacraments of the Church, the temple of the Holy Ghost. But there were other reasons for this strange practice. Many believed, in simplicity of mind, that the Blessed Sacrament in this case would answer as a substitute for the last rites of the Church, should it happen that the person had died suddenly or otherwise unprepared. It is generally said a stop was put to this practice by a miracle which was witnessed at the grave of a person recently buried. . . . The earth was scattered, as before, in all directions. This led to an examination as to the probable cause, and as it was

found that the Blessed Sacrament sprang forth from the body of the deceased person, it was concluded that it was a portent of the displeasure of God. The custom, it is said, ceased from that time. . . . The practice, as bordering on irreverence, was very early condemned, first by the third Council of Carthage, in A. D. 393, and afterwards by those of Auxerre, in France, and Trullo, at Constantinople. In examining ancient customs, we must be careful not to form hasty conclusions, and condemn our fathers in the faith for what may seem irreverent to us, but was never so intended by them (A History of the Mass, Rev. John O'Brien, A. M., pp. 378, 379).

By those two quotations it may be seen that an ancient "illustrious Pontiff" and " fathers in the faith," who had a Host placed in the grave with their dead bodies, were not infallible. For if they had been they would not have practiced a religious rite of faith that was a "displeasure of God," and which practice was condemned in Councils, "in A. D. 393," and later. And the fact that Councils, whose decrees and findings had to be ratified by a Pontiff, in order to make them valid and binding, condemned a religious rite or practice of an ancient "illustrious Pontiff," makes one or the other Pontiff, Pope, as having been in the wrong, in error, and not infalllble. For if the "illustrious Pontiff" had been infallible, and was guided by the Holy Ghost, he would have seen that what he did was a "displeasure of God," and he would then not have practiced what he and the ancient "fathers in the faith" did. And if the "illustrious Pontiff" was infallible and in the right, then the Councils that condemned the practice of the "illustrious Pontiff" and of the "fathers in the faith," were in the wrong, in error, and not infallible. Is that not so? Yes. It is only the blind who cannot see in the last two quotations that the Pope and "fathers in the faith" were only fallible

men after all. And if they were, then does that make the doctrine of the Real Presence true because they "in simplicity of mind," believed in it? Hardly.

The foregoing is also in line with the following, which is part of a letter that I received from a Catholic writer:

I quoted St. Ignatius to you. He learned Christian doctrine from no less a personage than St. John the Evangelist, the writer of the chapter (John 6th) of the Bible we are discussing. Who do you suppose knows the more of the proper interpretation of John VI—his disciple or you, nineteen hundred years later?

In reply to that one might ask:

"Who do you suppose knew the more of the proper interpretation of" the prophecies pertaining to the "promised Son of David," the supposed infallible Jewish Church Fathers, High Priests, Rulers of the Synagogue, Scribes and Pharisees, of all ages from the beginning of the time when the prophecies began to be interpreted in such a way that they believed the promised Son of David would be a "great temporal prince," or the "illiterate and ignorant" Peter and John (Acts iv. 13), who, the Jewish Church said, "knoweth not the law" (John vii. 49)—that is, its "proper interpretation"—because they accepted Christ as the Messiah, while the Jewish Church did not?

Here it might further be said:

Did Peter and John and the other Apostles, five hundred or more years later than the disciples of Moses and Isaiah and the other prophets, who began to interpret the prophecies in such a way as to lead the Jews to believe the "promised Son of David would be a great temporal prince," know "more of the proper interpretation of" the prophecies than did the disciples of Moses and Isaiah and the other prophets, or know more than did the "teaching body of the Jewish Church," which rejected Christ as the promised Messiah?

And did not the Galatian Christians, whom St. Paul

himself taught Christian doctrine, already in his day become "bewitched" (Gal. 3:1) into believing that the Spirit was to be received "by the works of the law" (Gal. 3:2) instead of "by the hearing of faith?" Yes. And what "Spirit" did he mean? Why, the Spirit of Christ. Read the following and see if that is not the case: Rom. 8:2; Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; Eph. 3:16, 17; 1 John 3:24, etc. And that Spirit is not received by the reception of the Eucharist, but "by faith" (Eph. 3:17), "by the hearing of faith" (Gal. 3:2). And that way of receiving the Spirit is in accordance with the way Christ said it was to be received when He said:

> The Spirit breatheth where he will; and thou *hearest* his voice (John iii. 8).

And the fruits of that Spirit—not of Communion —are:

> Charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency (or self-control), chastity (Gal. v. 22, 23).

And they that do those things "of the spirit, shall reap life everlasting" (Gal. 6:8). In view of that, then, were not the Galatians "bewitched" when they were led to believe that the Spirit was not to be received "by the hearing of faith?" Yes. If, then, people in the days of the Apostles already were "bewitched" by teachers of Christian doctrine, whom no doubt St. Paul himself placed over them, then why may not St. Ignatius, or any other early Church Father, have become "bewitched" into believing that the soul could be reached and nourished, or the Spirit be received, or Christ be "put on," by putting something supposedly Christ into the mouth, "by the flesh," "frequentation of the Eucharistic table," and begin to inter-

pret John VI. in the literal sense? But now it may be said, as the writer further said:

> Was not St. Paul an early father, and was not St. Ignatius, a disciple, the bosom friend of St. John the Evangelist, the beloved, and is it reasonable to suppose that he did not know what the writer of John VI meant, or that St. John did not know what Christ taught?

Saints Paul and John may be called "early fathers" but that does not say that St. Ignatius taught what they did, just as the disciples of Moses and the prophet Isaiah, or the Jewish Church "father" who was the first to teach that the "promised Son of David would be a great temporal prince," taught what Moses, Isaiah or other prophets taught (Isa. 2:4; 9:7; 16:5; etc.), or that the one whom St. Paul placed over the Galatians taught what he taught.

But now it may be said, as one wrote me:

> It is against all reason to believe that the Apostles and practically all Christians until the 16th century were wrong as to the meaning (of John vi. 52-64) of the Divine Founder of the Church, and that it remained for your "key" at this late date to unravel the "mystery" by making it no mystery at all.

But the Apostles, and Saints John and Paul showed it in their writings by saying the Spirit is received "by the hearing of faith," by hearing His voice, did not believe as the Church does now, or "all Christians until the 16th century" did. And my "key," of which he speaks, is, that the soul must be reached, fed, nourished, moved, impelled through the mind and will, a mental operation—not with the mouth, by eating a certain thing—and that, therefore, John 6: 52-64 should be interpreted in the spiritual sense, as we saw, just as the prophecies should have been interpreted in the

spiritual sense by the Jews. That is my "key" for the unraveling of the meaning of John 6th chapter, which the Church has made a "mystery," but which is no "mystery" after it is once understood how one receives the Spirit "by the hearing of faith," how one puts on the "spirit and life" of Christ, or of anyone else, and that it is the Spirit received "by the hearing of faith" that "quickeneth" (John 6:64) us to bring forth the fruits of Gal. 5:22, 23. There is no "mystery" in that, is there? No.

The Jewish Church, which feared the "seducing" teachings of Christ would undermine her teachings and authority, no doubt would have said to a defender of Christ, at the time He was accused of pretending to be a King, by claiming the prophecies were not to be taken in a literal, but in a spiritual, sense, and that the "promised Son of David" was not to be a great temporal prince, but a spiritual Prince, who would reign in the hearts of His people, by His Spirit:

> It is aginst all reason to believe that the Prophets and practically all the Jews from 500 to 1,500 years were wrong as to the meaning of the prophecies pertaining to the promised Son of David, and that it remained for your "key" at this late date to unravel the "mystery" of what kind of a King He would be, by your saying now that He was not to sit literally upon the literal, material throne of David His Father, or in the earthly house of Jacob, but that he was by His Spirit to dwell and reign as a Spiritual King in our hearts.

Could not the Jews, who did not want to accept Christ as a spiritual King, have said that to one who had a "key" to the unraveling of the prophecies, who should claim they should have been interpreted in the spiritual sense, and not in the literal sense, as the Jews did? Yes. Well, apply that to my "key" for the

interpretation of John 6th. And if that is applied to it, then it may be seen that John 6th does not teach a literal eating and drinking of something with the mouth, nor support the doctrine of the Real Presence.

But it may now be said, that for me to deny the doctrine that I thereby put "my own single opinion" against that of—

> The deliberately formed decision of an immense assemblage of the best qualified and most competently authorized, legitimate judges (Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. Stephen Keenan, p. 168).

For the Council of Trent, "an immense assemblage," decided or declared:

> If any one denies that the Holy Eucharist truly, really and substantially contains the Body and Blood, the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, therefore the whole Christ, and asserts that it is only a sign or figure without virtue, let him be anathema (Goffine, Rev. Leonard Goffine, p. 423).

Well, the Jewish Church also once held a "Council" (Matt. 26: 59-66), and the world knows the result. And was its decision a "thus saith the Lord" (The Faith of Our Fathers, p. 144)?

Now, if any one had refused "submission" to it and instead had accepted Christ, then would it have been "a great sin and the greatest act of criminal pride and presumption" (Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. Keenan, p. 168) to have put "his own single opinion" against that of the Jewish Sanhedrim, Grand Council, "an immense assemblage," which was "the best qualified, and most competently authorized, legitimate judge" to decide that Christ "hath blasphemed" and was "guilty of death" (Matt. 26:65, 66)? And was its decision "consolatory to the heart" of the Jews, when previous to that decision they were in doubt as to the real

status of Christ, as the Church claims the decisions of her Councils, tribunals, are "consolatory" to Catholics?

God does not Himself visibly preside [yet say He is a "concrete reality" and is "objectively present" in the Eucharist], in this collective body of men, for the purpose of deciding controversies, but for this end He organized a tribunal in this association (the Church), and delegated to it power and authority [like He did to the Jewish Church—see anno. to Deut. xvii. 8], to decide with infallible certainty [like the Jewish Church did in Matt. xxvi. 65, 66]. Is this not a rational theory, beautiful to the judgment and consolatory to the heart? (The Path which Led a Protestant, etc., P. H. Burnett, Rev. Jas. Sullivan, S. J., Ed., p. 77).

The very argument the Church makes use of for the denial of one to the right of individual interpretation of Scripture, which she calls "private judgment," the Jewish Church could have used, and no doubt did use, when she in her "Grand Council," "tribunal," found Christ supposedly guilty of blasphemy and death, and had the "civil arm" put Him to death, and when she said that those who believed in Christ as being the Messiah "knoweth not the law" (John 7:49), erred in "private judgment." Such being the case, then an "immense assemblage" may be wrong and in error with regard to its decisions of "controversies" and in the interpretation of "the law," and an individual's "own single opinion," "private judgment," be right; just as it also was in the case of Galileo, when he stood alone at one time against the decision of the Inquisition.

At a most inopportune moment Galileo forced the Pope to send his affair before the Inquisition. In a few days a Papal Decree, founded on a decision of the Inquisition [not on an enlightenment by the Holy Spirit of Truth] was issued, obliging

him to promise that he would no longer teach, as a demonstrated fact, that the earth moved around the sun, as such opinion appeared contrary to Scripture (Catholic Belief, Rev. J. F. Bruno, p. 332).

We now know that Galileo was right in his "own single opinion." Was that Papal Decree "safe guidance," though not given "with all the weight of infallible utterance?" And if one in "an immense assemblage" is in error, as the Jewish High-Priest was (Matt. 26:65), for instance, and leads forth with an error, and all the others in the assemblage follow him, as the Scribes and Pharisees followed the High-Priest (Matt. 26:65, 66), then will "an immense assemblage" of erring or of fallible men make an error a truth or make one man infallible? No, not by a good deal. It is, then, not always safe or the safest to look to a supposed infallible "immense assemblage" or to a human being for guidance in religious matters, is it, though there may be "wisdom in a multitude of counsel?" No. Yet there are in this so-called enlightened, intellectual and highly educated age some who look to a man for guidance in religious matters, instead of looking to the "Holy Spirit of Truth" (John 16:13) for that, as may be seen by the following, which is from a Catholic with whom I had discussed religion:

When you convert the Pope of Rome to your way of thinking and belief, then, and only then, will I believe as you do; and not before that!

No doubt that was about what the "obedient children" of the Jewish High-Priest and Church said to the believers in Christ; that is:

When you convert the High Priest of Jerusalem to your way of thinking and belief that Christ is the promised Messiah,

foretold by the prophets, then, and only then, will we believe as you do; and not before that!

It is not always safe, then, is it, to look to a supposed infallible human being, be it a High-Priest, a Pope, a Mormon President, or Mrs. Eddy,* for guidance in religious matters? No.

The argument we just saw is somewhat akin to the following:

> It is simply a question as to which knows the most on the subject—the Church, with the wisdom of the ages, or you with yours of yesterday (Plain Facts for Fair Minds, Rev. George M. Searle pp. 357, 358).
>
> It would be presumptuous for any one to put his ignorance against the wisdom and learning of eighteen hundred years of the Church, to criticise her rules and government, or that she could be prevailed upon to change *one iota* in anything (Extract from a Sunday sermon in a Catholic Church).

No doubt the Jewish Church at the time of Christ thought the same, that she, "with the wisdom of the ages," and her "learning of fifteen hundred years," knew more and better about the character and arrival and appearance of the promised Son of David than did the "illiterate and ignorant" Apostles, "that knoweth not the law" (John 7:49), and with their wisdom "of yesterday;" and that it "would be presumptuous" for them to think they could prevail upon the Jewish Church to "change *one iota* in anything" concerning her attitude towards the religion and teachings of Christ, which she regarded as a "pestiferous

---

*As Mrs. Eddy has since "passed on," having failed to "demonstrate" the "unreality" of congestion of the lungs—sickness—and death, Christian Scientists can no longer look to her for infallible guidance, unless they believe it is in her writings and should look for it there.

doctrine," a "heresy" (Acts 24:14; etc.), and which no doubt will be what the Church will characterize my explanation, interpretation and understanding of what it means to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood;" what the "bread of life" is; how to "put on Christ," etc., as given in this work.

Again, is the knowledge of the Truth or its revelation by the "Spirit of Truth," who is the *Paraclete* not only of the Pope and the "teaching body of the Catholic Church," as she claims, but of every individual believer, limited to and the prerogative of those only with "wisdom and learning?" And does the "Spirit of Truth" reveal to one, through the understanding, only according to the degree of the "wisdom and learning" one has, or to an institution only according to the "wisdom of the ages" it has? If so, then would not the Jewish Church, with her "wisdom and learning of the ages," have been right in refusing to accept Christ as her promised Messiah, because He did not fulfill and measure up to the prophecies as she interpreted and understood them with her "wisdom and learning of fifteen hundred years;" and the "illiterate and ignorant" Peter and John and the other Apostles, whose wisdom was but "of yesterday," have been wrong because they accepted Christ as the promised Messiah? Yes. The "Spirit of Truth," then, does not limit the knowledge of the Truth or reveal it to those only who possess "wisdom and learning," and withhold it from those who are "ignorant and illiterate," and who earnestly and sincerely pray to have it revealed to them, does He? No..

The Church, then, with the wisdom of the ages, or with her "wisdom and learning of eighteen hundred years," which does not, like the Jewish Church did not

about Christ, pray to have the Truth revealed to her, may and can be wrong and in error about the doctrine of the Real Presence, and an "ignorant and illiterate" person, whose wisdom is but of yesterday, and who prays to have the Truth revealed to him, may and can be right on the subject.

The foregoing is in line with the argument that a doctrine must be true because it has been the "universal belief" for centuries or ages of Church Fathers, the Church and her faithful children, and that the doctrine of the Real Presence, therefore, must be true, and because—

> Three-fourths of the world's Christians to-day believe in the real presence. Could it rest on a more solid foundation? (Truth, April, 1908, p. 6).

The following is what the Jews believed:

> The Jews believed that the promised Son of David was to be a great temporal prince; that he was to free the Jewish people and establish a great Jewish empire. . . . His preaching and humble life gave no encouragement of these hopes, and they refused to believe in Him as the promised Messiah, and they put Him to death (Notes on Ingersoll, Rev. L. A. Lambert, pp. 140, 141).

Now, because it was the "universal belief for centures or ages" of the Jews, or of "three-fourths" of them, that the "promised Son of David was to be a great temporal prince," according to the interpretations their Church placed upon the prophecies, then did it make it true when Christ came and was not "a great temporal prince" that He was a "seducer of the people," had committed blasphemy, and that they were justified in putting Him to death, because their law said that "he that blasphemeth he shall surely be put

to death" (Lev. 24: 16)? Hardly. Because it was the "universal belief for centuries or ages," prior to the time of Galileo, that the earth was flat and the sun went around it every twenty-four hours, did such a "universal belief" make it true, and make Galileo's "own single opinion" contrary thereto an "opinion that appeared contrary to Scripture" (Catholic Belief, p. 332), so that the supposed infallible Pope at the time required Galileo "to abjure this opinion condemned as heresy, and condemned him to do penance" (Truth, May, 1905, p. 22), when now we know that Galileo was right?

The Church says:

> To introduce a new doctrine into the Church, especially a doctrine which, according to our adversaries themselves, is too deep for human wit, and impervious to human sense, would require more ingenuity and craft than the keenest intellect is capable of. By what process of sophistry could any individual, or individuals, however gifted, have convinced millions of Christians that bread could, by a few words spoken over it, become the flesh, and wine the blood of the Son of God? No matter how gross the ignorance of the multitude, no matter how dark the age in which they lived, can we believe that there would have been no opposition made, no remonstrance uttered against the novelty! Ignorance favors self-interest, passion, sensuality, ambition; but what has ignorance to gain by the doctrine of the Real Presence? (The Real Presence, Rev. C. F. Smarius, S. J., p. 23)?

One "gain by the doctrine of the Real Presence" might be that of a ground on which to base the asking of "stipends" for the saying of Masses for special intentions, might it not?

In the year 1675 Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque is supposed to have received from our Lord the following revelation and promise:

I will grant the grace of final penitence to those who communicate on the first Friday of nine consecutive months (The Catholic News, November 13, 1901).

That is certainly a very important doctrine and promise, that if true, should have been taught and made "at the beginning of the Church;" for it assures the certain salvation of all those who once "communicate on the first Friday of nine consecutive months." The Church has taken that revelation as the base on which she rests her doctrine and teaching of the Sacred Heart, with its Communion on the "first Friday of each month" and a Plenary Indulgence, which she introduced since the year 1675. As that doctrine of "final penitence" is not true, then, otherwise Christ would have taught it while on earth—unless He gave to the world an incomplete way of salvation, which will hardly be admitted—then did anyone make any "opposition" to and utter a "remonstrance" against its introduction, by quoting Gal. 1:8 against it, and claim it was something "besides," that is, an addition to, that which the Apostles preached, and that, therefore, it is not true and should not be introduced into the Church? No. And has not the doctrine or teaching "convinced millions of Christians" of its truth, because most Catholics at this time have made the Communions of "the first Friday of nine consecutive months?" Yes. If, then, a false doctrine or teaching could be introduced by the Church since 1675 A. D., then could not about any doctrine or teaching have been introduced in the earlier ages of Christianity, and that those ages were "dark" and grossly ignorant enough for the introduction of the doctrine or teaching of the Real Presence? Yes. And as that doctrine gave unction to the "advance of the sacerdotal theory,"

and gave a ground on which "stipends" might be asked for saying Masses for special intentions, there was no objection, opposition or remonstrance raised against it by any one. And if there had been he or they would have been silenced or excommunicated, just as one now would be silenced or excommunicated who believed he could get the Church "to change *one iota* in anything," and insisted on her doing so.

The doctrine, then, "that bread could, by a few words spoken over it, become the flesh, and wine the blood of the Son of God," could easily have been introduced into the Church," especially a doctrine which gave greater unction to the "advance of the sacerdotal theory," if a priest "out of a piece of bread" could make "a God," just as he, "by a few words spoken over" and breathing "thrice upon the water in the form of a cross" (The Complete Office of Holy Week, Benziger Brothers, Publishers, pp. 489-491), is supposed to make out of common natural water a Holy Water—

> Of most singular and efficacious virtue, having the property of purifying everything it touches, and banishing demons (Benedictine Parish Monthly, December, 1909, p. 8).

So, then, in view of what we have seen, do not be influenced in your beliefs about the truth of the doctrine of the Real Presence, by the arguments of the Church, that she, with the "wisdom and learning of eighteen hundred years," knows better than an "illiterate and ignorant" person, whose wisdom may be but "of yesterday;" that the doctrine is true because it has been the "universal belief for centuries and ages" of the Church, her Fathers and her faithful children; is the belief of three-fourths of the world's

Christians to-day;" that no age was so dark, grossly ignorant as to permit of its introduction without "opposition" and "remonstrance," or because—

> The whole Catholic Church and her general councils [of fallible men], have clearly defined it. Their authority in expounding Scripture ought to be as decisive of this controversy as it was decisive against former heresies (Clearing the Way, Rev. Xavier Sutton, p. 82).

And no doubt the Jewish Church thought and claimed the same "in expounding" the prophecies. But now it may be said, if the doctrine is not true, then—

> Was the whole Church led into error and idolatry? And that by Christ her Divine Founder? (The Sacramental Life of the Church, Rev. B. J. Otten, p. 97)?

Was "the whole Jewish Church led into error and idolatry," which idolatry Christ "came expressly to abolish" (Question-Box, Rev. Conway, pp. 430, 431, and Real Presence, Rev. Smarius, p. 37)? And "that by God her Divine Founder," that the Messiah "was to be a great temporal prince?" Yet the Church regards the Jewish Church as having been infallible and preserved from error, as may be seen by the following, one of which is an annotation to Deut. 17: 8:

> *If thou perceive*, etc.—Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the church-guides of the Old Testament, in deciding, without appeal, all controversies relating to the law; promising that they should not err therein; and surely he has not done less for the church-guides of the New Testament.
>
> We maintain our teaching body to be infallible, because God has made them so; as in the Old Law He made the Scribes and Pharisees, who were the public ministers of His Church (though often, no doubt, personally sinners), infallible, for the safety of those whom they taught. That these teachers of the ancient Church were infallible, is more than evident from Matt. xxiii. 1—"Upon the chair of Moses have sitten the

Scribes and Pharisees; *all therefore whatsoever* they shall say unto you, *observe and do.* Were they not *infallible teachers,* even God could not thus command us to *obey* them; and surely no one will make the teachers of the better Christian Church [the Catholic, of course] inferior to these (A Doctrinal Catechism, Rev. Stephen Keenan, Third American Edition, pp. 369, 370).

When the supposed infallible "chief priests and ancients," Scribes and Pharisees, the "teaching body" of the Jewish Church, "persuaded the people, that they should ask for Barabbas and make Jesus away" (Matt. 27:20), and said to the ministers, officers, of the law, who would not apprehend Jesus:

Are you also seduced? Hath any one of the rulers (of the Synagogue) believed in Him, or of the Pharisees. But this multitude, *that knoweth not the law,* are accursed (John vii. 47-49), (Meaning that if they understood the law and the prophets they would see Christ was not the promised Messiah, and they would then not be "seduced" by Him and believe in Him),

were they preserved from erring in "controversies relating to the law?" And "was God Himself responsible for the error" they made in interpreting the law in such a way that they understood the promised Messiah would be "a great temporal prince," and because Christ was not such when He came they crucified Him as one guilty of "blasphemy?" And were the Jews, the "multitude," "deceived by obeying" in obedience to the command to "observe and do," when they did as they were "moved" (Mark 15:11) by the "teaching body" of their church to do and asked "for Barabbas and make Jesus away?" And was God "the cause of their error," as the Catholic Church claims would be the case with those who believed in her, and she "could preach error," as may be seen by this?

If, therefore, the Catholic Church could preach error, would

not God Himself be responsible for the error? And could not the faithful soul say to God with all reverence and truth: Thou hast commanded me [As Thou didst the Jews], O Lord, to hear Thy Church. If I am deceived by obeying her [As the Jews were for obeying their Church], Thou art the cause of my error [As Thou wast of the Jews (?)]—(The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 90).

That the teachers, the teaching body, the Scribes and Pharisees, of the Old Law were by God made "infallible for the safety of those whom they taught" is, however, contradicted by the following:

They are blind, and leaders of the blind (Matt. 15:14).

Take heed and beware of the leaven (doctrine) of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. 16:6).

And it came to pass when Jesus had fully ended these words, the people were in admiration at His doctrine. For He was teaching them as one having power (authority), and not as their Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 7:28, 29).

If the Scribes and Pharisees, the "teaching body" of the Jewish Church, had been infallible teachers "for the safety of those whom they taught," then could it have been said of them that they were "blind guides," "leaders of the blind," that the people were to "take heed and beware" of their doctrines, when they were not as those taught by Christ? And may not the same be said now of the Catholic Church with regard to some of her teachings, notably of that of the Real Presence, and that "the whole Church was led into error and idolatry" by her supposed infallible teachers?

We have now seen what answer can be made, if the doctrine of the Real Presence is not true, to the question, then, "Was the whole Church led into error and idolatry," not by Christ, but by her teachers and guides?

After I, then, became convinced that the Church

erred with regard to the doctrine in question, as well as with others not noted in this work, I took the advice of a Catholic writer, who said:

> To have been born and bred in a certain religion is not sound reason for remaining in it when you come to see clearly that it is not true (Catholic Belief, Rev. Joseph F. D. Bruno, p. 238).

and left the religion, the Roman Catholic, in which I had been "born and bred." For I had "come to see clearly" that she, in the main, "is not true," and I wanted to be true to God and to my conscience and not be a hypocrite or become one by outwardly professing belief in that in which I no longer believed. And—

> How can there be certainty about other points of doctrine peculiar to herself, when in one point, and that so fundamental, she has thus grievously failed—erred (The Re-Union of Christendom, London Catholic Truth Society, p. 3)?

Had the occasion not come to me to read much for pastime, and had not had "too much time to think," as a priest told me while I was lying bed-fast, after I told him about thoughts intruding into my mind pertaining to some of the teachings of the Church, and had not "digged a little deeper" than the Church goes with her teachings, then I would most certainly never have discovered the errors that are to be found in the Church, and I would never have become a non-Catholic, but would without the least doubt or question be to-day as good and practical a Catholic as I was before I became afflicted and began to read for pastime, the much reading also leading me to much questioning and thinking, for which God gave me a Thinker, with the result as already stated.

And if there is anything Catholicity, or the teachings of the Church, especially the Real Presence, cannot stand it is that of reasoning, searching and much thinking, or "liberty of thought" to think freely about them. That is the reason why the Church would have us "beware of curious scrutiny into" anything she teaches, and condemns and forbids her members "liberty of thought," as may be seen by the following:

Thou must beware of curious and useless scrutiny into this most profound Sacrament (of the Eucharist), if thou wouldst not sink into the depth of doubt (The Following of Christ, Thomas à Kempis, p. 791).

Rome, Dec. 23.—The Pope this morning received the Cardinals, who offered him their Christmas greetings. The Pontiff made a long address, in which he condemned the excessive liberty of thought indulged in at the present time (The Catholic News, January 1, 1902).

The Church forbids, as against reason, common sense, and the welfare of man, liberty of thought on matters, whether in the material or spiritual order, which have been clearly demonstrated and definitely ascertained [As, for instance, that "Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table?"]; she refuses to abandon it on those which are still open to reasonable question (Plain Facts for Fair Minds, Rev. G. M. Searle, p. 297).

But if we are not to think, or should not think, then why did God give us a Thinker and the faculty of understanding? Why should we not have the "liberty of thought" to think and be allowed to think about what we believe or are asked to believe? Cannot the truth bear free and deep thinking? If anything cannot bear free and deep thinking, without sinking one "into the depth of doubt" as to its being true, then it is not the truth, is it? No. And that is the case with the doctrine of the Real Presence, it cannot, as we saw, stand free and deep thinking, "digging a

little deeper" than the Church goes with her teachings about it, such as I gave it while yet a good Catholic, and gave it since I left the Church. I read and thought myself out of the Church step by step, and not with one "fell swoop" left the Church, as most apostates did because of some personal differences with a priest or the Church or some member of the Church or for some other than doctrinal reasons. I simply had time to read and think and be "curious" to know certain things, which have been noted in this work. That is what led me out of the Church.

Of course, some may doubt that I ever was a Catholic or a good and a practical one, and that I was only a nominal one. That the reader may know what kind of a Catholic I was before I became afflicted and began to read and think for pastime, I will cite an instance or two. After I had been about fifteen months in a certain neighborhood, two Catholic Sisters, who taught in a parochial school in the neighborhood, came into the store one morning, I being in business then in that neighborhood, when my sister, who a short time before had come to the city to clerk in the store, waited on them. They must have noticed a family resemblance between my sister and myself, for they asked her if she were my sister. On receiving an affirmative reply, they said to her:

> You ought to feel proud of such a model young man being your brother, who goes to church and the Sacraments so regularly.

I was not in the store at the time, but when I came in my sister said she had a "compliment" for me and told me of it. At that time I was in the twenty-seventh year of my age, and had been away from home

and among strangers in St. Louis, Chicago and Kansas City for about five years.

At another time a priest, who for years had had a good opportunity to observe my ways, told my brother that he thought "John was too good a Catholic ever to lose his faith." The priest said that to my brother when my brother told him, in answer to the priest's question whether I still clung to Christian Science since I came to Atchison, that I had given up Christian Science and was practicing the Catholic religion as usual. My brother told me that when he came to visit me while I was yet bed-fast. For a few months before I came home here in Atchison I had Christian Science to treat me after *materia medica* said it could not do anything more for me, and after friends and life-long acquaintances had urged me to try Christian Science as a last hope, although Christian Science did not in the end help me, either, and, if anything, it left me in a worse physical condition than that in which I was when I submitted myself to its treatments, having been treated by twelve different healers, two of them C. S. D's.

Another time a friend told me that a friend of hers told her that she thought "it was so nice in me for going to church so regularly with my wife." The fact was I was not married and did not go to church with my supposed wife but went to church with my sister. By that incident it may be seen, then, that even strangers to me, for if they had not been they would have known that I was not married, noticed my regular attendance at church. Such, then, was my practice and reputation as a practical Catholic up to the time that I became afflicted and submitted myself to Christian Science for physical healing after *materia medica*

could do no more for me, I trying Christian Science as a last hope, just as a drowning man, it is said, "will grasp at a straw." The claim that usually is made by the Church when one leaves her fold, that it was because one never had been more than a "nominal" Catholic, anyway, who tired of her yoke, or who was but a "wretched outcast," as it is claimed those are who leave the Church, is hardly applicable in my case, is it?

> Let the reader examine the list of names [of converts to Catholicity, given in the book from which this quotation is made], and mark the strong contrast between the character of these converts and the wretched outcasts from the Church who seek refuge in Protestantism.—A. Y. (The Church What It Is Not and What It Is, Very Rev. Michael J. Casey, p. 180).

Nor can it be said that I left the Church because I wanted to—

> Enjoy some temporal good which cannot be gained without renouncing the faith (Plain Facts for Fair Minds, Rev. George M. Searle, p. 296).

For I was, when I underwent a change in religious convictions, and was no longer a Catholic at heart and in mind, still bedfast with, as it were, one foot in the grave, the doctors having had given me up to die, I trying *materia medica* again after Christian Science failed to heal me, and I at the time not expecting ever to get off my bed again alive. Neither can it truthfully be said that it was because of "the pride of intellect," or that I was "stubborn and too proud to accept the teachings of the only true Church," as the Church often claims is the case with those who leave her fold, that made me a non-Catholic and leave the Church. For when one is supposed to be at the brink of the grave, as I was

at the time, that is certainly no time for one, after many years of suffering, to change his religious convictions without good reasons and plunge himself into hell at the last moment of his earthly existence, simply because the "pride of the intellect," which "arms of the intellect," when they began to think seriously, revolted at the thought of Christ-God being in the stomach of the communicant; that He is by "natural heat" or otherwise mutilated, mangled and deprived of His life, and that we "feed upon His blessed body," after the manner of cannibalism, so that, then, the "blood of God flows in our veins," or that the Spirit is received "by the flesh" instead of "by the hearing of faith." Is that not so?

So much, then, for the kind of a Catholic that I was before I became afflicted and began to read and think for pastime, and became a non-Catholic.

CHAPTER IX.

The Invocation of the Blessed Virgin.

Next to the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the doctrine of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin forms, as we saw, "an essential part of the Catholic system." That the doctrine is an error, the discovery of which would alone be sufficient to make a Catholic, who is consistent, a non-Catholic, I will attempt to show in this chapter.

I have nothing against honoring and venerating the memory of the mother of Christ, as one would the memory of the mother of Christopher Columbus, George Washington, Father Damian, Pope Leo XIII., or the mother of any one else, nor against imitating her virtues and perfections, just as one would those of any other good, virtuous person, be that person a wife, mother, husband, father or not. But when it comes to worshiping her as our personal, omnipresent, special protectress and invoking her intercession or praying to her, then we tread upon the absolutely impossible, the erroneous, etc.

For the Church says the following of her, which makes it utterly impossible for her to give us personal special protection, or to hear the many prayers that are addressed to her, or to a Saint, for Saints are not invoked much fewer times than she is:

Catholics adore God alone. They love and honor Mary as the Mother of God and the greatest of His saints, but they

know she is only a creature, and that, therefore, to adore her would be idolatry (Question-Box Answers, Rev. Bertrand L. Conway, p. 515).

Catholics do not believe that the Blessed Virgin is in *any way* equal or even comparable to God, for she, being a creature, although the most highly favored, is infinitely less than God (Catholic Belief, Rev. Joseph F. Bruno, p. 227).

Her honor, therefore, was reflected on her Son. But, while He is very God, she is only a human being; she, the Mother of Christ, is only a creature—the most highly honored indeed of all created beings (Life of the Blessed Virgin, Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, D. D., L. D., Haydock's Bible, End of Old Testament Division, p. 12, chapter vi., col. 1).

The Church also says the following, which we know is true:

We can direct our complete attention to one thing only at a time; we can follow but one train of thought at any given moment. Should we attempt to attend to many different things at once, indistinctness and confusion must inevitably result. Such is one of the differences between God's knowledge and ours (Thoughts For All Times, Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan, pp. 23, 24).

If, then, the Blessed Virgin "is only a creature," is not "in any way equal or even comparable to God," is "infinitely less than God," though by God "the most highly honored indeed of all created beings," and a creature can direct "complete attention to one thing only at a time," otherwise "indistinctness and confusion must inevitably result," then it is utterly impossible for her to hear and listen to the many petitions or prayers addressed to her, and to give us the special personal protection the Church claims she gives to those who place themselves under her patronage or protection.

It is that which I will attempt to show in this

chapter. And I will attempt to do so with "the arms of the intellect," the weapons or method, as we saw, the Church says she will one day use in her warfare with Infidelity.

If, then, the Church will use "the arms of the intellect" in her warfare with Infidelity, when the day for that should come, she certainly ought now to be willing to submit the doctrine of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, and of the Saints, which I will interweave at times, to an analysis with the same weapons, ought she not? If so, then I will analyze or examine the doctrine in question with "the arms of the intellect," which I would define to mean to be reason, carnal arguments, understanding, mathematical proofs, analogy, etc.

The following is the way in which I discovered the error in the doctrine of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, which may include that of the Saints, for they are not invoked very much fewer times than she is.

There are supposed to be fully two hundred and fifty millions of Catholics in the world. Of that number we will say—after allowing six out of every ten to be poor praying Catholics, and children not old enough to pray—there are one hundred million "practical" Catholics who say at least one Hail Mary a day. Now a Hail Mary, as follows:

> Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now, and at the hour of our death. Amen (Any Catholic prayer book),

cannot be said with any devotion in less than ten seconds of time, which would then make one billion seconds of time of prayers said every twenty-four

hours, by only one hundred million of the two hundred and fifty millions of Catholics in the world. Now of the hundred millions of "practical" Catholics, we will say that one-half of them, or fifty millions—which is getting rather low in numbers—recite or say two more Hail Marys daily besides the one mentioned above, which would make another billion (twenty times fifty millions) seconds of time of prayers every twenty-four hours, or two billions so far. Then we will say that of all the Catholics in the world only two millions—which is certainly a very low number—besides saying daily the three Hail Marys already mentioned, say the Rosary daily, although I know some who say it more than once daily. As the Rosary contains at the least fifty-three Hail Marys, it cannot be said with any devotion in less time than five hundred seconds—eight and one-third minutes—we have, then, another billion (five hundred times two millions) seconds of time of prayers, or three billions so far. If now we take the scatterings of prayers to her the world over, such as the Angelus, extra Rosarys, Litanies of the Blessed Virgin, Scapular prayers, ejaculatory prayers, etc., it will easily make another billion seconds of time of prayers, or four billion seconds of time of prayers that she would have to hear and listen to every day of twenty-four hours of eighty-six thousand and four hundred seconds of time. If now we divide four billion by eighty-six thousand and four hundred, the number of seconds in a day of twenty-four hours, we get a result or quotient of forty-six thousand two hundred and ninety-six (46,296). Now if the Blessed Virgin should hear all the prayers addressed to her, even at the low estimate made, she would have to listen to forty-six thousand two hundred and ninety-six peti-

tions every second of time from one end of the year to the other, or, in other words, have to listen to 46,296 petitions at one and the same time, simultaneously, every second of time from one end of the year to the other. That is true according to "the arms of the intellect," mathematical proofs, is it not? Well, can she do that if "she is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," and if—

> God cannot create a being equal to Himself (Tactics of Infidels, Rev. L. A. Lambert, p. 39),

which she would have to be in order to do so? No. For no being except God Almighty Himself can do that, listen to over 46,000 prayers at one time, simultaneously, without "indistinctness and confusion."

The President of the United States is by the people "the most highly honored indeed of all created beings." But could he at one and the same time, simultaneously, listen to and answer over 46,000 long distance telephone calls, were there that many long distance telephones in the White House, and they all called for him at one and the same time, simultaneously, every second of time while he were President? No. Well, it is just as impossible for the Blessed Virgin, who is, like the President, "only a creature," "infinitely less than God," to listen to and answer over 46,000 petitions, equal to over 46,000 long distance telephone calls, at one and the same time, simultaneously. That is what "the arms of the intellect"—mathematical proofs, and mathematics is from God—tell us.

Again, is this not also a difficulty and another impossibility for the Blessed Virgin to do, that of understanding at one and the same time, simultaneously, the many petitions that are addressed to her in the

many different languages in which they are said the world over? For the English, the Germans, the French, the Italians, the Bohemians, the Spanish, and the many other nationalities too numerous to mention, all pray to her in their own language, and no doubt at one and the same time, too. And if they do, then is that not another impossible thing for her, as well as for the Saints, to do, to understand the many petitions that are addressed to them at the same time, simultaneously, in the many different languages in which the petitions are made? Yes.

Insurmountable difficulties and impossibilities are to be met with when one analyzes, with the instruments the Church would use in her warfare with infidelity, the doctrine of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin. Yet a priest had this to say about the going to her for help:

> There on my desk stand two pictures: one is of my mother, the other is of the Blessed Virgin. I adore my mother . . . and I adore the Blessed Virgin. I can go to my mother and confide in her and get help; so I believe I can go to the Mother of Christ and get help.

That is possible with him and his mother, who at the most probably had but ten children to "confide in her and get help." But how would it be if his mother had one hundred million of adopted children all of whom had an equal right with him to "confide in her and get help," and they all confided in her and wanted her help in special matters, at one and the same time, simultaneously? Do you now see the utter impossibility of going or praying to one who "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," and getting help or protection from such a one?

We must remember that a family of ten children

is quite a different one from that of a world of more than ten million times ten children or people, so that the priest's belief or idea that he can confide and get help from the Blessed Virgin, because he can confide in his mother and get help, is a greatly mistaken one.

Here is more of the impossible that adds to the already impossible:

> One of the sweetest graces Our Lord gave us was at the very close of His life, when, in the person of St. John, He made Mary our Mother. What has she not done for us? She has loved us, taken joy in us, interest in our work, and from our birth she has had her arm around us (The Catholic News, September 12, 1900).

But how can she have her "arm around us," that is, give us special protection, when she is not omnipresent to us and, as a finite being, cannot be present simultaneously to over one hundred million people?

> The Festival of the Scapular . . . comes from the legend that in the beginning of the thirteenth century the sixth general of the Carmelite order, Simon Stock, received the scapular ("which consists of two small pieces of cloth with pictures of the Blessed Virgin upon them, which are blessed, and worn over the shoulders (under all clothing), hanging upon the breast and back") from the Blessed Virgin, which would be to him and to all who carried it, a badge of Her special protection, and that Mary afterwards appeared to Pope John XXII. and advised him to give more indulgences to this Order than he had already granted in 1322 (Goffine, p. 799).
>
> As it is considered a mark of distinction by men, to have attendants wearing their livery, so does the Blessed Virgin like to see her servants wear her scapular; it should be a sign of their having devoted themselves to her service [as though she were God and was to be served instead of God the Father], and of their belonging to the family [of over one hundred million children] of the mother of God.—St. Alphonsus Liguori (The Scapular Book, p. 87).

Let us now see how she has "her arm around us" and what "special protection" one receives for "wearing her livery," the Scapular:

> Some time ago a lineman on the Third avenue elevated in N——— met with an accident. When he was being examined a Catholic standing by noted that the man wore a scapular and hurried for a priest. Death occurred within half an hour of the accident (The Catholic Register, Nov. 18, 1904).

If the Blessed Virgin had "her arm around him," then how was it that she let him fall to his death? How is it that priests meet with many and unforseen accidents and deaths, even being shot to death in church while performing their priestly duties, if the wearing of the Scapular of the Blessed Virgin, which all priests and good Catholics wear, is "a badge of her special protection?" Why do good Catholics have accidents, some of them fatal? "By their fruits you shall know them"—the Rosary, the Scapular.

And if the wearing of the Scapular is "a badge of her special protection" from the devil, then how is it that Catholics sin so much that they have to go, or ought to go, to Confession monthly? For surely to go to Confession implies having sins to confess. And the Church says he "is the instigator of all sin" (The Faith That Never Dies, p. 28).

It is claimed by the Church and by some of her members that it was the devil who put doubts into my mind as to the truth of some of the teachings of the Church. If that is true, then how was it that the Blessed Virgin did not protect me against "the snares of the devil?" For I had from childhood on up to the time that those doubts came to me prayed daily to the Blessed Virgin to "deliver me from the snares of the

devil," and even at the time those doubts came to me I was wearing her Scapular.

By what we have noted it may be seen that the Blessed Virgin gives us neither temporal nor spiritual protection, and that the claims of the Church that she does are only make-believes, etc.

Here is some more that adds to the already impossible:

At that supreme moment (death) Mary will come to us if, during life, we have been faithful in asking her help. "Behold, my child," she will say, "I am with thee, thou hast called me. How often hast thou said to me, Hail, full of grace. And now, my child [one of the hundred million or so], I greet thee, full of the grace of my divine Son, who is about to reward thee with eternal glory" (The Faith That Never Dies or The Priest of God in The Catholic Home, p. 275).

When a soul, who during life had an especial devotion to the Blessed Virgin, is to be released [from purgatory—a nice place for the Blessed Virgin to let any one be sent to "who during life had an especial devotion to" her], Mary herself often deigns to appear, and personally conducts the soul to paradise (Tabernacle and Purgatory, November, 1905, p. 95).

(Probably she was conducting a soul from purgatory "to paradise" at the time "a lineman," who had on her Scapular, "met with an accident," she could not be at both places, the doors of purgatory and the earth, at the same time.)

There (in Heaven) we shall gaze upon that blessed face which is the delight of Jesus and of the blessed in heaven. We shall listen to the loving voice of our holy Mother Mary, and hear from her lips the sweet words: "Welcome, my child, welcome home at last" (The Prodigal Son, Rev. Michael Müller, p. 571).

Is all that possible of being done by one who "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," to be per-

sonally present with the dying, when many are dying in the same hour all hours of the day, and when some are dying for hours before they become really dead; to "personally conduct the soul" from purgatory "to paradise," and to "welcome us home at last" in Heaven? No.

And now while she is supposed to be doing all that, there are addressed to her over 46,000 prayers every second of time from the one hundred million or so "practical" Catholics in the world. And if it should be the month of October or the Lenten season, when the faithful should daily "join in the recitation of the beads," the Rosary, "in all churches and chapels" (The Catholic News, Oct. 10, 1900, and Feb. 20, 1901), then the prayers during October and Lent must ascend to her at a rate that is far, far greater than 46,000 every second of time. Besides all that, they have in Italy, France and Belgium "Associations of the Perpetual Rosary," where "day and night thousands, succeeding each other," recite "the Rosary for blessings on themselves and for the Church" (The Catholic News, June 26, 1901). That alone is more than one can attend to, listen to and hear all those Rosary prayers, who "is only a creature," the Blessed Virgin, to whom the many perpetual Rosary prayers are addressed. And such being the case, it becomes very self-evident that the doctrine in question is an error. And if you are a Catholic can you still, with "the arms of the intellect," give "an internal assent of the intellect" to that doctrine as being true?

Because some believe, as reported in Catholic publications, that they have received answers to their prayers to the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints, and that therefore the doctrine cannot be an error, is it always

certain that the supposed things received were received in answer to prayers to them, and that they may not have been mere coincidences? I will quote a few testimonials to see if they may not have been mere coincidences:

> Thanks are returned to the Sacred Heart for employment obtained. Our Blessed Lady, St. Joseph, and St. Anthony were invoked . . . A child of Mary returns thanks to the Blessed Virgin for a temporal favor (The Catholic News, Jan. 9, 1901).

We will now see if those supposed answers to prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the saints may not have been but coincidences. When I went to another city at one time to locate there I advertised once in a daily paper for a position, or employment. I did not pray to the Blessed Virgin or to any saint to procure a position for me, yet within a week I went to work in a store which was just the kind I could wish for in which to learn a mercantile business. No doubt if I had prayed to them to obtain such a place for me and had obtained it within a week, as I did without praying to them, I would have been led to believe that it was in answer to my prayers to them. But if I had so believed would I not have been mistaken, the obtaining of the position having been only a coincidence? Yes.

One time, on the last Sunday night in August, thieves got into our house and carried away my watch. I went to the police station and reported it, at the same time giving the officers the number of the works and the case of the watch. When a few weeks after the watch had been stolen it had not yet been found, I gave up all thought of ever getting the watch back again. But two days before Christmas—about four months after the watch had been stolen—a detective from the police department brought the watch to me.

Now, if I had in the meantime prayed to the Blessed Virgin and the saints to recover the watch for me, then, on its being returned to me, would I not have been mistaken had I believed its recovery was due to my prayers to them, and would not its recovery have been but a coincidence? Yes. And is the recovery of a stolen gold watch not "a temporal favor?" Yes. These supposed answers to prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, then, may be only coincidences, may they not? Yes. And they do not, then, prove the truth of the doctrine in question, do they?

It is the same with those who give testimonials of having been healed through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, and at the shrine of some saints. Oftentimes after a long period of sickness a patient will begin to "naturally improve," as the expression goes, and finally get entirely well without either doctors, Christian Science, or prayers to the Blessed Virgin or the saints. If there is any efficacy in the prayers to them, or in their medals, then why do Catholics become sick the same as non-Catholics do under the same circumstances? If all that were true that the Church says about the efficacy of prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, and about the merits of their medals, then no Catholic should ever be sick, or at least if one became sick, to be sick but a day or so or until one could get a blessed medal of some saint, or could make a Novena.

Here is what the Church says about the Blessed Virgin and blessed medals:

> No infirmity is so malignant that it will not yield without delay to the efficacy of the Blessed Virgin's name (Annals of the Blessed Lady of Victory, January, 1904, p. 5).
>
> We had a driving horse that got blood poisoning in his leg.

The veterinary surgeon told us there was little hope of saving him. I placed a medal of Our Blessed Lady of Victory in his stall and he was better in a few days. Now he is as sound as ever, for which we thank Our Blessed Lady (*Ibid.* p. 17).

The blessed medals of St. Benedict . . . may also be put into water, which men or even cattle may drink in order to be preserved from or be cured of sickness (St. Benedict's Manual, Rev. W. M. Mayer, O. S. B., p. 632).

Now, if all that is true, then is there any possible excuse for a Catholic, or his horses, cattle or hogs, to get sick or remain sick? Is not drinking water so plentiful that Catholics should always have a plentiful supply of it into which a blessed medal had been put or could be put, and thus continually enjoy the blessings of good health? Yes. Yet even clerics and sisters, who have or might have, if they were consistent and believed what the Church tells them to believe, all those supposed preventives of and cures for sickness, and who pray much to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, suffer as much from sickness and early deaths as non-Catholics do. Read the following and see if they do not:

Bishop *Roe,* . . . accompanied by Monsignor *Doe,* left for the South. Bishop *Roe* has suffered so much from bronchitis and asthma that his physician insisted on the trip for the benefit of his health . . . Monsignor *Doe* has not been in the best of health for some time and his physician also prescribed a Southern trip as quite necessary (The Catholic News).

(How inconsistent that makes leading Catholic Church dignitaries appear to read of their going South for the benefit of their health, when, as they are supposed to believe, "no infirmity is so malignant that it will not yield without delay to the efficacy of the Blessed Virgin's name," or when drinking water into

which a blessed medal had been put it would "preserve from or cure" their ailments.)

Rev. *Roe* was born . . . 41 years ago. . . . His health failing, he went to *Doeville,* Col., where he performed priestly duties for two years, when he was compelled to relinquish work, . . . and died (The Catholic Register).

(In this case one may wonder, when "he performed priestly duties," whether or not that included the preaching of the "efficacy of the Blessed Virgin's name" in cases of "infirmity" or sickness, the merits of blessed medals, etc.)

Sister *Doe,* aged 46, died in St. *Roe's* convent to-day . . . Sister *Doe* had been paralyzed twelve years, nine years of which she had spent sitting in a chair (Daily paper).

It was also said of her that she was dying for two hours and that during all that time she, as one expressed it who was present, "suffered something most terribly." In hearing of cases like that or somewhat similar to it, it is enough to make, or it ought to make, the thoughtful question the truth of the efficacy of blessed medals of the Blessed Lady of Victory or of the saints. the use of which is supposed to have cured animals which could not exercise faith, so that the merits of healing must be inherent in the medals and not in the patient's faith in the medals. Yet one who could exercise faith, a nun or Sister, who is supposed to have been a "Child of Mary," suffered the same as though there were no Lady of Victory medals, one of which healed a horse of "blood poisoning," as though a horse was more precious in the sight of God than a nun, or even priests, who have to change climates for their health. Had an apostate Catholic suffered as that Sister did, the Church would have

said that it was a manifest visitation of the wrath of God on one for leaving the Catholic Church, as she claims was the case with a reformer or two of the sixteenth century who suffered a somewhat tragic end.

That there is nothing much but error attached to the belief in the efficacy of prayers to the Blessed Virgin, in novenas to her and in her medals, I know by my own experiences and observation. Years before I had had any doubts as to the truth of any of the teachings of the Church, I made novenas and wore Lady of Victory medals, having at one time four tied to a string around my neck. Yet I did not receive that for which I made the novenas and wore the medals, which was for restoration to health. Had I at that time been restored to health the occasion for reading so much for pastime would not have come to me, and I would without the least doubt be to-day as good a Catholic as I was before I became afflicted and began to read for pastime.

Neither do I know of one solitary case where anyone was ever healed or received any lasting benefit in health through making novenas (a novena means a nine days' prayer and the reception of Communion on the last day for a special object) to the Blessed Virgin or the saints, or in wearing "Lady of Victory" medals, or in visiting their shrines. Some thought they had received benefit from making use of them, but it was only temporary, lasting only about as long as they could keep their imaginations highly excited. after which they would have a relapse and be no better than they were before they made novenas, wore "Lady of Victory" medals, or visited shrines. That reported cures are not always true, I know to be so. Some time ago there was reported in the press the supposed

miraculous cures of a number of afflicted people at the shrine of St. Anne, saying that certain ones, whose names and addresses were given, had been afflicted with paralysis for years and that at the end of a novena one "left the church without support," another "walked from the church to-day and it was the first time he had walked since infancy," etc. I wrote to two of them, the ones just spoken of, and these are the letters I received from them:

I was benefited some at the shrine of St. Anne, St. Anne, Ill., but I still must use a wheel chair and crutches.

(That is from one who "left the church without support;" she "still must use a wheel chair and crutches." Certainly a miraculous "cure!")

Well he is not walking yet but he is a great deal stronger than what he was before he went to St. Anne. He walked that day by the help of others. He has never walked, he is not eight years old yet, but I think after going next year again to St. Anne he will walk (From his relative).

That is how miraculously one was cured at the shrine of St. Anne, who "walked from the church to-day and it was the first time he had walked since infancy," as reported by the press. Draw your own conclusions.

I know of another case where one was not helped or cured by novenas, but was later cured by a specialist. A young person about twenty years of age became afflicted with an ailment that made him bedfast for nearly two years. He got into such a condition that after a year or so he was taken to a Sisters' hospital. While there for months he had the best of medical skill and attention, and as he got no better novenas were finally made for his recovery. But they did him not a particle of good. Had anyone then

asked any of those who helped to make the novenas why he was not cured or helped, the answer would no doubt have been, which is usually the answer in cases of failure to cure, that "it was not God's will that he should be cured or get well."

About six months after the novenas were made a specialist from another city was called to see him. After the specialist examined the patient he told his relatives that if they brought him to the doctor's private sanitarium he would cure the patient in about four months. The patient was taken on a stretcher to the sanitarium. Within four months he walked unassisted out of the sanitarium, and traveled a few hundred miles to his home. After he had been home a week or so word was received that he was home, "could now walk, was looking well and feeling fine." And from latest accounts it appears he is permanently cured. Now, if it was not God's will he should get well, when the novenas were made for his recovery, then why was it that certain non-supernatural means later made him well? And what becomes of the Blessed Virgin's supposed "incomparable influence with her Heavenly Father" (The Faith of Our Fathers. Gibbons, p. 224), if she could not persuade God to change His will, and had the patient get well when the novenas were made for him to get well? Nothing but a make-believe. Think of that question again: If it was not God's will the patient should get well when the novenas were made for his recovery, because he did not at the time get well, then what becomes of the Blessed Virgin's "incomparable influence with" God, so that we should invoke her and place ourselves under her care and special protection? Nothing but a "pious belief." For it is utterly impossible for one

who "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," to listen to and answer over forty-six thousand petitions, novena prayers, etc., every second of time in the year.

And the claim, then, that it was not God's will one should get well, when novenas were made for one's recovery, and one did not get well, does not hold good, does it, in view of the fact that a non-Catholic specialist cured a patient after novenas failed to cure him?

The case in question is enough to open the eyes of anyone who would exercise a little "liberty of thought," that the doctrine of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, as well as that of the saints, is manifestly an error, and that it never is because of God's will that one should not be healed, that one is not healed or cured when novenas are made for one's recovery.

But as Catholics, as a rule, do not judge their supposed channels of supernatural and sanctifying graces, or things, "by their fruits," there is not any likelihood that any of them will get their eyes opened to the error of the doctrine in question, and they will keep on invoking the Blessed Virgin and the saints, make novenas to them, visit their shrines, wear scapulars, blessed medals, say the Rosary, attend May devotions, etc., etc., and believe that when an ailing person is not healed by and through them that it "was not God's will he should be healed," though he may be healed by a specialist later.

We will now see what the Church has to say about how the Blessed Virgin and the saints can know of our prayers addressed to them.

How the Blessed Virgin and the saints know the prayers and wants of those who call upon them is a mystery, if you will

. . . But the explanation given by Catholic theologians ought to satisfy an intelligent mind [who rejects the findings of "the arms of the intellect"]; viz., that those who enjoy the Vision of God [which is called properly "The Beatific Vision"] see and know all things "in the mirror of the Trinity"—that is, in God's seeing and knowing; because they see His essence, and His knowledge is one thing with that (A Short Cut to The True Church, Rev. Edmund Hill, pp. 163, 164).

But since the saints are not omniscient, can they hear our prayers? They need not be omniscient to know for what we pray. Cannot God make known to them our cares? . . . We need not be anxious with regard to the manner in which the saints become cognizant of our prayers, since God has a thousand ways by which to make our needs known to them (Goffine, p. 605).

The power of the Blessed Virgin or the saints to answer our prayers no more implies omnipresence than my power to accede to the request of a friend three thousand miles away implies my presence there. When Eliseus saw the ambush prepared for the king of Israel, was he necessarily in Syria at the time? (IV. Kings vi. 9). By no means. So God can reveal our prayers to His mother and His saints in heaven as readily as He can give His revelation to His saints on earth (Question-Box Answers, Rev. B. L. Conway, pp. 516, 517).

That shows that the Blessed Virgin and the saints must become "cognizant of our prayers and cares" before they can answer them, just as one must become cognizant of "the request of a friend three thousand miles away" before one can "accede to the request." All that would be possible for them were it a one family affair of ten children or so, or a one parish affair. But when it comes to the prayers and cares of one hundred million or so people on earth then it is mathematically, utterly impossible for anyone, who "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," to hear or have revealed to her or a saint the over forty-six thousand petitions that are addressed to her or a saint

every second of time in the year. Could the writers of the foregoing see every second of time in the year, simultaneously, at one time, over forty-six thousand different things in a continuously moving panoramic mirror, and "accede to the requests" of over forty-six thousand friends every second of time in the year, whether or not they were "three thousand miles away," and though there were "a thousand ways" by which their friends could get their requests of favors to them? And if God reveals "our prayers to His mother and His saints," would they not have to receive them at a rate of over forty-six thousand every second of time? Yes. Could Eliseus have received revelations had they come to him at a rate of over forty-six thousand at one time, simultaneously? No, decidedly not. It is the same with the Blessed Virgin and the saints having revealed to them our many prayers and cares. And in view, then, of what we have noted, probably that is the reason patients were not really cured by novenas to the Blessed Virgin and at the shrines of saints, and why the Blessed Virgin does not answer the many prayers, special and otherwise, that are addressed to her which pertain to temporal things. For instances, I know of two married women who prayed specially to the Blessed Virgin daily for months that their coming unborn babes might be safely born. Yet both lost their babes at birth, and one mother came very nearly losing her life, too. Now, why was it thus that after they had so faithfully and with such confidence invoked the Blessed Virgin they should both lose their babes at birth? If it be said that it was not God's will that the babes should have lived, then what becomes of the claim of her supposed "incomparable influence with her Heavenly Father" (Faith

of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, p. 224), if she could not get Him to change His will? That is what she is supposed to do, to get or persuade God to change His will. And if she can not do that then what is the use or need of invoking her? And if it is already God's will to do that which we want done then to invoke her or a saint would simply be useless and needless, would it not? Yes. The prayers of the two married women, then, were not answered because the Blessed Virgin could not hear and answer the over forty-six thousand petitions which are addressed to her in so many different languages every second of time, measured by time on earth and not by "clocks in heaven," as one answered me in an argument on the subject, saying:

Who told you they had clocks in Heaven?

Temporal things prayed for, as, for instances, safe child-births, restoration to health, etc., or even spiritual things, such as deliverance "from the snares of the devil," must be answered, if answered at all, in temporal time and they can not have the eternity of heaven in which they may be answered, which is implied in the answer in question.

But granting that the babes had been safely born and had lived, would that not have been mere coincidences, being that other babes, whose mothers did not pray to the Blessed Virgin that they might be safely born and live, were safely born and live?

The following is also a matter that presents a difficulty: that of praying to different ones in the same prayer or prayers, such as praying the Rosary, Litany of the Saints, prayers in the League of the Sacred Heart (2d degree), where ten Hail Marys are

said to one Our Father, etc., where one first prays to God, then to the Blessed Virgin, then to God again, then to some saints, then to God again, etc. For when praying to any one we should have that one in mind or thought, so that first we should have God in mind or thought when praying to Him the part in a prayer that is addressed to Him, then the Blessed Virgin when praying the part of a prayer addressed to her, then God again, then this or that saint, etc. Would not that kind of praying be a sort of a seesaw, zigzag or flitting about way of praying? And if so, then what kind of praying would that be where the mind would be constantly flitting about and back and forth? It would be only an automatic, a mechanical prayer of the lips, would it not? And if so, then would that be praying with the heart or the spirit as Christ said (John 4:24) we should, or as St. Paul said we should, by "praying at all times in the spirit" (Eph. 6:18)?

That this repetition praying, especially of the Hail Mary, is nothing but an automatic performance with the lips, and is not a praying with the heart and spirit, may be seen by the following:

> This rosary ("for the poor souls," to which is attached an indulgence of 48,810 days) can be prayed devoutly, and without haste, in five or six minutes, and with what immense benefit for the poor souls. It should also be remembered, that these prayers must be said with the lips. . . . It can even be prayed while engaged at a work that does not claim your entire attention (Magazine, Perpetual Adoration, 1903, p. 18).

Is that a prayer, or praying, by repeating fifty-three times the same words "with the lips while engaged at a work that does not claim your entire attention," or when counting beads, which requires attention that engages the mind some? What is the difference

between that kind of praying and that of the heathens who believed that by much speaking, or "vain repetitions," they would be heard, and of which Christ spoke when He said:

> And when you are praying, speak not much, as the heathens. For they think that in their much speaking they may be heard (Matt. 6:7)?

Again, in praying to God, then to the Blessed Virgin, then to the saints, in one prayer, as in the Rosary, the Litany of the Saints, etc., then would not the Blessed Virgin and the saints have to be as omnipotent and omniscient as God Himself in order to hear those many prayers addressed to them, even though God could reveal the prayers to them? Yes. But as there is only one God, who "can not create a being equal to Himself," one Omnipotent Being, then do you now see again that it is utterly impossible for the Blessed Virgin and the saints to hear or have revealed to them the many petitions that are addressed to them by the about one hundred million "practical" Catholics in the world? Then think how much more impossible it would be were the whole world Catholic and all old enough to pray prayed to them. Then instead of about forty-six thousand petitions being addressed to them there would be about four hundred and sixty thousand addressed to them every second of time in the year. And would that not be an impossible thing for finite creatures, however exalted, glorified and "most highly honored" they may be, to do, do about four hundred and sixty thousand things simultaneously every second of time? Yes, most positively so.

Again, what is a prayer? Is it not an aspiration, an outpouring of the feelings of the heart, be it to

God or to anyone else, in other words, the mouth speaking the longings and the fullness of the heart? Yes. Well, is it measured by an exact number and a stereotyped set of words, and those words repeated fifty-three times, as the Hail Mary in the Rosary? When you want or ask a favor of anyone do you do so by saying a certain repeated number of times the same certain words and while you are doing so be counting between your fingers a certain number of beads in order to make sure that you said or repeated them just exactly so many times, and no more and no less? Would you, for instance, pour out your feelings or love to a loved one in that way? No, to all those questions.

To pray counted prayers, then, as, for instance, the prayers of the Rosary—the Rosary is the chain-like beaded article that some carry fastened to a belt around the waist, with a crucifix at the end, reaching nearly to their ankles—counted on beads, is not a speaking of the feelings or fullness of the heart, is it? No. It is then only an automatic or mechanical performance of the lips and fingers, a vain repetition of words, a heathen practice, as Christ noted (Matt. 6:7), is it not? Yes, most manifestly it is.

The same can be said about praying to a certain saint or saints certain stereotyped prayers a certain number of times on certain days, or a certain number of times a week or a month, etc., as the Church designates.

In view, then, of all that we have noted, is not the doctrine of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the saints a manifest error, etc.? And do you now wonder and understand why it is that notwithstanding the fact that the Church says:

No infirmity is so malignant that it will not yield without delay to the efficacy of the Blessed Virgin's name (Annals of The Blessed Lady of Victory, January, 1904, p. 5); and

It is the correct thing to pray to St. Joseph for money. . . . To St. Roche for restoration of health . . . To St. Blase for a cure of all diseases of the throat. . . . To St. Catherine for a husband (The Correct Thing for Catholics, Lelia H. Bugg, pp. 191, 192),

that many good Catholics, as well as clerics and nuns, are afflicted with incurable "malignant" infirmities, or diseases; have, as a rule, no more money and are no freer from poverty and want; are not restored to health any sooner or oftener; are no freer from throat troubles, bronchitis—as the bishop, who had to go "South" on account of it—tonsilitis, diphtheria, etc., than non-Catholics are, who do not invoke the Blessed Virgin and the saints, nor visit their shrines; and why all Catholic women are not either married or are in cloisters to be God's "own loved spouses" (Advice to Parents, a Priest, p. 56)? It is simply because such teachings are what our analysis, with "the arms of the intellect," has shown them to be; namely, errors, etc., and there can, then, be nothing to the promises held out to the people by the Church by praying to the Blessed Virgin or to a certain saint for a certain thing or things. And to judge from the fact that ailing clerics will go "South" or to Colorado, or make changes in climate for the benefit of their health, instead of visiting the shrines of saints, as, for instance, those of St. Anne—of which there is more than one in America—it makes it appear that they do not believe very strongly or do not take much stock in what their Church teaches, and which they themselves at one time, when yet in good health, probably preached.

"By their fruits you shall know them"—the Rosary, the Scapular, blessed medals, novenas, Shrines.

We will now look at another feature in connection with the worshiping and the invocation of the Blessed Virgin, and which appears to be a species of idolatry. The following is an account of the closing services of what is called "May Devotions," which are devotions to her. Besides having during the month of May services in her honor in church every evening—in some places they are in the morning—the Church has usually closing services in her honor on the evening of the last day of the month of May. The last one I attended was on a Sunday evening, when there was quite a large attendance. There were two features in connection with the closing services to which I wish to call attention. One was the sermon, the other the procession in the aisles of the church. The sermon was an exhortation that we should become the children of Mary; that we should daily recite the Rosary in her honor, because of the many spiritual indulgences which may thereby be gained; to be enrolled in her Scapular, etc. The procession was composed of little girls, who threw flowers over their shoulders as they marched, and of young ladies carrying lighted candles, who were followed by four young ladies who carried a decorated platform on which was a statue of the Blessed Virgin. As the procession moved along the girls repeatedly sang "*Sancta Maria, ora, ora, ora pro nobis,*" which means, "Holy Mary, pray, pray, pray for us." Now, according to what we have seen was it not an error to exhort the faithful to "daily recite the Rosary," "be enrolled with the Scapular," etc.? And was it not then also a species of idolatry to carry a statue of the Blessed Virgin in the procession, which

lasted fully twenty minutes, and singing to her to pray for them? Yes.

It would be like for the colored people in the United States, who certainly could call Abraham Lincoln "Blessed Lincoln," to carry in procession in the aisles of their church a statue of him and singing and praying to him, saying:

Blessed Lincoln, pray, pray, pray for us.

And if they did that, then would that not be idolatry? For they would be doing more than simply honoring his memory, against which nothing could be said. And if so, then is it not likewise idolatry to carry a statue of the Blessed Virgin, who, like Lincoln, "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," though by God "the most highly honored indeed of all created beings," and singing to her to pray for them? For that would be doing more than simply honoring her memory, against which nothing could be said.

And no doubt during the procession the marchers imagined that she was looking down from heaven with pleasure upon them, as though they were the only ones out of one hundred million or so elsewhere in the world, who at the same time were also imagining or believing they were attracting her favorable attention. Besides that, she may at the very same time have been at the bedside of some dying one and said: "Behold, my child, I am with you," or she may have been "personally conducting a soul to paradise" from purgatory, or she may have been in heaven greeting an arrival with the words, "Welcome, my child, welcome at home at last," or she may have been listening to the reciters of the "perpetual Rosary" in Italy, France or Belgium, or may have been healing

some horse of blood poisoning or some other ailment, or may have been giving personal special protection to some lineman on a pole in the antipodes, who was wearing her "livery," the Scapular, etc., etc., and not for one second saw the procession in her honor. When one thinks of all that, then does it not become very clear that to invoke her, when she "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," and who can then be no more omnipresent to and omniscient of the cares and needs of one hundred million people than you or I, is a manifest error? For the special worshiping of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, especially St. Joseph, there are separate altars in Catholic churches. That is why most of them have at least three altars. The center or main altar is for the worship of God, the one to the left of it for the special worship of the Blessed Virgin, and the one to the right for that of St. Joseph. As these two altars are sometimes quite costly, and must be maintained, there is, then, a financial burden on Catholics for perpetuating and practicing what is nothing much but error, etc.

Here is no doubt the way the worship of the Blessed Virgin originated:

> The worship of the Virgin Mary was introduced to meet, to gratify and to attach itself upon, the superstition which had long prevailed amongst the heathen in respect to Isis, Diana, and other goddesses, who had their millions of worshippers (The At-One-Ment Between God and Man, Elder Russell, p. 69).

Yes, it was to satisfy the superstitious minds of former heathens, who had become converted, that she was introduced as a powerful intercessor, who could equal, and even surpass, the supposed powers of Isis, Diana, etc., and that she should then be worshiped and

invoked instead of their former heathen goddesses. And to further satisfy the converts, statues of the Blessed Virgin were made, just as there were statues of Isis, Diana, etc., before which they were to kneel and pray—not to the statues themselves, but to the one they represented, just as when they were yet heathens they had been accustomed to doing before heathen statues, to which they prayed directly. The invocation of the Saints had no doubt a somewhat similar origin, and in time resulted in this:

> Pope Boniface IV. first suggested the celebration of this festival (All Saints), when in 610 he ordered that the Pantheon, a pagan temple, at Rome, dedicated to all the gods, should be converted into a Christian church, and the relics of the saints, dispersed through the different Roman cemeteries, taken up and placed therein. He then dedicated the Church to the Blessed Virgin and all the martyrs (Goffine, p. 905).

By that it may be seen how the Catholic Church substituted for the heathen or pagan gods the Blessed Virgin and the saints, who were then worshiped and invoked in place of the pagan gods, thus substituting one error for another.

We will now look at the Scripture texts which the Church cites as a warrant for her doctrine of the worship and invocation of the Blessed Virgin. It rests on these texts:

> Woman, behold thy son . . . (Son), Behold thy mother (John 19:26, 27).

The Church, commenting on them, says:

> Now, what has private judgment to say to this Word? Traditional private judgment, in the name of Protestantism, discovers here only a lesson in filial piety. There is that, undoubtedly; but will your private judgment and mine, taking the standpoint of common sense and insisting on the right of criti-

cism, be satisfied with such an interpretation? I think not. We have a why or two to ask—an awkward monosyllable for the religious notions of some folks. 1. Why did our Savior, if He meant nothing more than to provide His widowed Mother with a home and a guardian, select that time of all others for the purpose? Why did He not wait till after His Resurrection, and then arrange the matter privately? . . . 2. But, secondly, why was the Blessed Virgin there? What was she doing at the foot of the cross at all [What were "Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalen" (John xix. 25) "doing at the foot of the cross at all?"]? A perfectly fair question, and by no means flippant. . . . 3. But, thirdly, why was St. John there? Had not all the apostles forsaken their Master and fled on seeing Him deliver Himself up to His enemies? . . . Must we not admit that he was there by a special providence—that our Savior took care to have him there [No more so than that Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalen were there]? (A Short Cut to The True Church, Rev. Edmund Hill, pp. 133, 134, 137).

Those *whys* can best be answered by making an analogy and applying it to a mother of to-day, who, if not unable from prostration, and it were believed she could endure the ordeal of seeing her son placed on a gallows and executed, would be present at the execution of her son. It would be because of obedience to the call of her instinctive mother-love for her son, would it not? Yes; for no mother ever, or rarely ever, forsakes her own child at his most trying period, his execution, no matter how ungrateful, cruel or abusive he may have been towards her, or how degraded and great a criminal, or "pestilent fellow and blasphemer," as an Orthodox church at the time of Christ regarded Him to be, he may have become, she will cling to him till he is placed on the gallows and is executed. That, then, is *why* the Blessed Virgin was "at the cross at all." And if the mother was present at the execution of her son, and a true friend of her son, as

St. John was to Christ, was the only friend who did not desert the son even in his most trying moments, and he was also present, and the son saw the constancy of his friend, then would that not be the most propitious time, just before being executed and death overcame him, to commend his widowed mother to the care of such a friend, and his friend to the broken-hearted mother, to solace and support her in her most trying moments? Yes. Well, it was the same with Christ on the cross.

That, then, is *why* Christ did not "wait till after His resurrection, and then arrange the matter privately." The Blessed Virgin needed then and there the solace and support of some one. Is that, then, not reasonable and plausible why Christ did not wait till after His Resurrection to commend His mother to the care of St. John, and him to her, to bind or seal a true friendship and "filial piety?" Yes; and that that was all that was meant by it is proven by the fact that—

> From that hour, the disciple took her to his own (John 19:27),

or, as the Catholic Bible says, in an annotation to John 19:27:

> Ver. 27. *The disciple took her to his own* home, or into his own care, not for his mother, by the Greek expression.

Yes, that is all it meant; he was to take her into his own care, not for his spiritual mother, nor for us as our mother. It was simply a filial arrangement between the two, and it had no further significance, and it could not have according to what we have seen with "the arms of the intellect."

Again, if St. John was at the cross "by a special providence—that our Savior took care to have him

there," in order to deliver to him the doctrine of the protection, comfort and invocation of the Blessed Virgin, as taught by the Catholic Church, then *why* did Christ not have St. Peter there instead, if he was to be the Supreme Pastor of Christ's Church, and was to "feed the sheep and the lambs?" It seems that that *why* is an "awkward monosyllable for the" Catholic Church, if St. Peter was to be the head of Christ's Church, and was to "feed," teach, its ministers and members, as the Church claims. For as it is, it is a case of the "sheep," St. John, "feeding" the shepherd, St. Peter, as otherwise St. Peter would not have known of the Catholic doctrine of the protection, comfort and intercession of the Blessed Virgin, which he was to "feed" to the sheep and the lambs. Now, *why* was not St. Peter at the cross "by a special providence," instead of St. John, to receive at first hand the doctrine in question, if he was to be the chief pastor and was to "feed," teach, the sheep and the lambs? But the fact that St. John was at the cross, and St. Peter was not, proves that St. Peter was not to be the Supreme Pastor of Christ's Church, and that St. John was the truer friend of the two of Christ, and that he was not at the cross "by a special providence," in order to receive the supposed doctrine in question.

Again, if by the words "behold thy mother," which were addressed only to St. John as in person supposedly to us, were intended by Christ for all in all times, then why are not these words, Drink ye all of it (Matt. 26:27), intended for all and in all times, and all then receive Communion in both kinds? The reason the Church limits Communion in both kinds only to clerics, is the following:

No precept was given by our Saviour, at the institution of it, for all the laity *to partake* in both kinds; which is the point to be proved by protestants. They reply, that the words of our Saviour, Drink ye all of it (Matt. xxvi. 27), contain a positive command for all to drink of the cup. We answer, That the twelve apostles were *all* that were present with our Saviour at the last supper, as St. Matthew, Mark and Luke witness. The most, therefore, that can be proved from these words of our Saviour, *Drink ye all of it*, is that He gave command to the twelve apostles [And St. Paul to the laity—1 Cor. xi. 26], and to priests, to partake in both kinds [As St. Paul told the Corinthians], as often as they consecrate this sacrament . . . But no such command is here given to the laity (The Protestants' Objections to Points of Catholic Doctrine, p. 114).

The Church also teaches the following:

All commands given by Christ in terms personal to the Apostles, descend and are obligatory upon us, unless they are limited by express words [Where are those "express words" in Matt. xxvi.?], or by the temporary nature of the command itself (The Path Which Led a Protestant Lawyer, etc., Burnett, Rev. Jas. Sullivan, S. J., Ed., p. 61).

If, then, the words, "Drink ye all of it," were intended only for the Apostles and their supposed successors, the clerics, although it appears St. Paul did not understand them in that way, nor were they "limited by express words" to the Apostles, then by the same rule of interpretation the words, "Woman, behold thy son; (Son), behold thy mother," which "were addressed *not* to the people at large, but only to the" (The Faith of Our Fathers, Cardinal Gibbons, p. 344) Apostle St. John, and appears to have been only of a "temporary nature," were also limited to him. Here is even the proof of that:

Now there stood by the cross of Jesus, his mother, AND his mother's sister, Mary of Cleophas, AND Mary Magdalen (John 19:25).

Now, if Christ had intended for His mother to be a mother to all of us in the sense the Church teaches, then should He not also have said to her:

Woman, behold thy daughters?

And then to "Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalen," whom He also loved as He did St. John:

Daughters, behold thy mother?

Yes, if there is to be any consistent rule of interpretation and process of reasoning.

But the fact that He did not do so when they were present at the time He spoke to St. John the words, "Behold thy mother," proves irrefutably and conclusively that those words were limited to the Blessed Virgin and St. John. That is "the most, therefore, that can be proved from these words of our Savior," "Woman, behold thy son," (Son), "behold thy mother," they were limited to her and him, were only of a "temporary nature," and had no further significance than a "filial arrangement" between them, where the two were to be united in a bond of friendship and he was to console her and look after her temporal welfare. And that fact is further proven if the following is true:

Tradition says that the apostles were re-united around the dying bed of the Blessed Virgin, singing the praises of her who was soon to become their glorious queen (Catholic Ceremonies and Explanation of The Ecclesiastical Year, Rev. Abbé Durand, p. 157.)

If the foregoing is true, and granting that it is, and we should invoke and pray to her as the Church teaches, then should not the Apostles, or at least St. John, who wrote many years after her death, have mentioned that fact? But the fact that they did not

do so shows that they did not believe in invoking her or the saints, and for that reason they did not tell or exhort the faithful to pray to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, as the Church does now, even though the "patriarchs and prophets," the Blessed Virgin and some saints had passed on to glory before the Apostles did. For St. Paul, in his epistles, to "repeatedly ask for himself the prayers of his disciples" (The Faith of Our Fathers, James Cardinal Gibbons, pp. 187, 188). was quite a different proposition from that of one hundred million or so praying to any one in heaven, who "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," one asking for this, another for that, etc. One can ask of or speak to thousands on earth at the same time, and all understand him, but if thousands should speak to one who "is only a creature," whether or not "the most highly honored" by God or by the people, at one and the same time, as we saw over forty-six thousand do every second of time in the year to the Blessed Virgin, in many different languages, one could not make anything out of it but babel and confusion. Is that not so? Yes. The doctrine of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, and of the saints, then, is an error, is it not?

The Church has also made the Blessed Virgin quite a competitor for the prerogatives of God, and is about to take His place, according to this:

The Blessed Virgin said the following consoling words to St. Bridget: "No matter how great a sinner one may be, if he returns to me I am always ready to receive him, providing he comes with a sincere heart and true repentance. I do not look upon the greatness of his guilt but upon his disposition. I am called the 'Mother of Mercy,' and I am so indeed" (Tabernacle and Purgatory, May, 1905, p. 15).

No need of the God, then, whom Christ declared unto us, is there, if sinners are to return to the Blessed Virgin, "with a sincere heart and true repentance?" No. She has indeed been made by the Church quite a competitor for the prerogatives of God, in having us—

Fly to the arms of Mary when the devil comes too near us; a comfort in all our afflictions and tribulations; the most merciful; the mirror of justice; the seat of wisdom; the health of the sick [Excepting those clerics who go "South," to Colorado, etc., for their health]; the comfortress of the afflicted; Virgin most powerful; the Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, our life, our sweetness and our hope. To Thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve. To Thee do we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this valley of tears. Turn, then, most gracious Advocate [But St. John said Christ was our Advocate (1 John ii. 1), who must then be our "most gracious Advocate"], Thine eyes of mercy towards us. And after this, our exile, show unto us the blessed fruit of Thy womb, Jesus. Remember, O most gracious Virgin Mary, that never was it known that any one who fled to Thy protection, implored Thy help, and sought Thy intercession was left unaided [Excepting the two mothers who lost their babes at birth, etc.]. Inspired with this confidence [As the two mothers were], I fly unto Thee, O Virgin of virgins, my mother. To thee I come [With over 46,000 others at the same time]; before Thee I stand, sinful and sorrowful. O Mother of the Word Incarnate, despise not my petitions but in Thy mercy hear and answer me. Amen (Any Catholic Prayer Book).

But how is she to hear and answer one when to do so she would have to do over ninety-two thousand things at one and the same time every second of time from one end of the year to the other? For to answer over forty-six thousand petitions every second of time in the year requires about as much time as it does to hear them, even though she did not deliberate over the petitions whether she should answer them or

not, and she answered them at once after the prayers had ended.

Does not the erroneousness of the doctrine of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin become more and more apparent the deeper one looks into it, "digs a little deeper?" And is not the discovery that it is an error, etc., in itself a sufficient reason to make a Catholic, who wants to be consistent and does not want to become a hypocrite by professing belief in that to which he can no longer give "an internal assent of the intellect," a non-Catholic? Yes. Well, that is what it made me. And such being the case, then do you blame me for openly becoming a non-Catholic and leaving the Church?

I could say much more on the subject dealt with in this chapter, but it seems enough has been said to show anyone who does not absolutely reject his intellect and "throw it under the feet" of blind and unthinking faith, that the doctrine in question is manifestly and unquestionably an error and can not stand the test of an analysis with the "arms of the intellect." And to say more than that, then, is simply superfluous.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion I want to say, and especially to the Catholics who may chance to read this work, and who may as a result have the first doubt to enter their minds as to the truth of all the teachings of the Church, that the conviction that the doctrines of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, with its concomitants, and the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin are errors, etc., did not come to me without much mental perturbation and much prayer. For I had been taught from childhood on up, as all "born and bred" Catholics are, that the "Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church" was the church, and the only church, which Christ established on earth. That she was infallible and guided by the Holy Spirit, who was left only to her teaching body (Annotation to II. Pet. 1:20). That she could not, therefore, possibly err or teach an error. That to doubt or question the truth of any of her teachings or to forsake her faith would be a "mortal sin," and that—

> Every one is obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to become a member of the Catholic Church, to believe her doctrine, to use her means of grace, and to submit to her authority (Deharbe's Catechism No. 1, p. 145).

With that thought, then, on my mind many and many a time when I would be reading Catholic writings, and thoughts would come to me that were at variance with what I was reading, or which seemed to me to be absurd and self-contradictory, or seemed

unscriptural, I would have mental perturbations and would earnestly and sincerely pray by saying:

O God, reveal to me the truth!

Yes, I wanted to know the truth. I did not ask to know whether or not the Catholic Church was the "true Church," or whether or not her "credentials," as being the only Church of Christ, were genuine, or whether or not she was the "first and oldest" church, or whether or not she was the "one and only Apostolic Church," but I wanted to know the truth. Besides that, from the very depths of my mind and heart the following prayer came forth spontaneously, and I uttered it many and many a time with tears streaming from my eyes and wetting the pillow upon which my head was lying while I was bedfast, enduring great physical pain and suffering, before I really became a non-Catholic and left the Church:

Dear Heavenly Father, in the name of Jesus Christ I ask that Thou wouldst give me wisdom and enlighten my understanding that I may understand and know Thee, Jesus Christ (John xvii. 3), and my true being! Reveal to me the truth and lead me into the path in which I may please Thee, and whithersoever Thou wouldst lead me thither give me the strength and courage to go. O God, should the path that I am in now, which is leading me to believe differently from what I once believed, end in error and darkness, then I ask in the name of Jesus Christ that Thou wouldst let my earthly existence come to an end before I should do anything that would scandalize any so as to endanger their faith in Thee or their salvation. Dear Father, should the path, however, lead me to the light and the truth, then I ask that Thou wouldst quicken my understanding and increase my wisdom so that I may attain to the knowledge of the truth.

Now, if you believe God hears and answers many a time uttered sincere prayers to know the truth and

have it revealed to one, and He did not "let my earthly existence come to an end," for I was bedridden at the time I began to utter that prayer, or He did not let me become paralyzed so that I could not have gotten off alive from my bed—for my spine is quite badly injured, having gotten it injured in a street car mishap—but instead have been enabled to get off my bed, so that I can write, and write this work, then do you believe that instead of revealing the truth to me He let me fall into error, or sent me error instead of the truth, and let me get into the power of the devil, as some claim? And if I am now really in error and in the power of the devil, then is that the way God answers many times uttered sincere prayers to know the truth and have it revealed to one through the understanding? Does God give one a stone (error) when one asks for bread (truth)? And if He did, but which I do not believe He does, then would that not be contrary to what a human father would do (Matt. 7:9)? And are we not exhorted or bidden to ask, as may be seen by the following?

Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and you shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you (Matt. vii. 7).

The Lord will give thee in all things (spiritual) understanding (2 Tim. ii. 7).

That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and of revelation, in the knowledge of him (Eph. i. 17).

But if any of you want wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men abundantly, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him (Jas. i. 5).

Did I not, in the prayers given in this work, besides in others not given, ask for wisdom and understanding, and ask, seek and knock for the truth? If

so, then why or how can I now be in error and in the power of the devil, because I underwent a change of convictions with regard to the doctrines of the Real Presence of Christ-God in the Eucharist, which, as we saw, is the Church's "most important doctrine," the "keystone of her worship," etc., and of the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin? Or does God, when we earnestly and sincerely pray to Him to reveal the truth to us, instead let the devil answer our prayers, by letting him deceive and lead us into error? I do not believe He does. But whether He did or not, or whether or not I did wrong by openly becoming a non-Catholic and leaving the Church, that I will leave to the reader to say. Of course, the Church will say, as a Catholic writer has already said of me, that I was led into error by the devil. For when yet a Catholic I could not and had not the right to ask God to reveal the truth to me, or to question the truth of any of the teachings of the Church,

> Because God had already revealed it to me, and it is not a part of the divine plan to give private revelations to all who demand them . . . Our Lord laid on all men as a condition to salvation, docility to the teachings of the Church [The Catholic, of course], when he said (here quotes Mark xvi. 15, 16), . . Private revelations, then, . . . are things which God has distinctly told us He will not grant . . . A Catholic may not even speculatively question the truth of his religion.

(No doubt the Jewish Church would have said the same to one who should have prayed to have the truth about Christ revealed to him, and who should have questioned her interpretations and teachings, that the "promised Son of David was to be a great temporal prince.")

Is the foregoing quotation, excepting the last

sentence, true in view of the texts just quoted, and in view of the following?

Let us therefore, as many as are perfect, be thus minded; and if in anything you be otherwise minded, *this also God will reveal to you* (Phil. iii. 15)?

God, then, *does* "give private revelations" to those who ask Him to reveal the truth to them, "if in anything they be otherwise minded" than that which the Church teaches, does He not? Yes. And nowhere does it say in Holy Writ that "God has distinctly told us He will not grant private revelations" to those who ask to know the truth and have it revealed to them. In fact, that claim is flatly contradicted by the texts just quoted, is it not?

And did not some saints in the Middle Ages have "private revelations," when they claimed the Lord personally appeared to them and held personal conversations with them on religious subjects, which is a good deal more than I claim for myself? For I had no visions or apparitions, but the convictions or truth came to me through the understanding, and as St. Paul said, as we saw, spiritual truths and convictions should.

When thoughts or convictions came to me that made me "otherwise minded" than that which the Church teaches concerning the Real Presence of Christ-God in the Eucharist, and the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, I asked God to reveal the truth to me, instead of saying, "My God, I believe!" That is what a priest told me to say when doubts came to my mind as to the truth of some of the teachings of the Church, and began to "speculatively question the truth" of some of her teachings. While I was bedfast a priest came to have a talk with me on some of the teachings of the Church, and when I expressed a doubt as to

the truth of some of them he told me to say, "My God, I believe!" as though God could not discern the thoughts and secrets in the mind and heart of man and could be lied to without His knowing it. For if one doubts a thing one can not at the same time truthfully say, "My God, I believe!" without telling God a lie. Especially would such have been the case when I could no longer give "an internal assent of the intellect" to some of the teachings of the Church, which, as we saw, is required of a Catholic.

And, surely, I could no longer give "an internal assent of the intellect," for instance, to the teachings of the late Pope Leo. XIII., that "Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table," or that the Spirit is received "by the flesh"—mouth-eating Communion, after the intellect—understanding—plainly told me that Christ is put on through a mental act of the mind and will, "by the hearing of faith"—assimilating words of truth. And I do not believe God requires us to believe by faith that which the intellect—understanding—can not assent to, and which the intellect tells us to the contrary. It is the same with regard to the invocation of the Blessed Virgin, for the "arms of the intellect," mathematical proofs, tell the understanding that it is utterly impossible for one who "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," to give special personal, omnipresent help and protection to about one hundred million "practical" Catholics in different places in the world, as the Church would have us believe, and at the very same time, simultaneously, hear over forty-six thousand petitions, and that every second of time in the year.

Well, when I could, then, no longer give an "internal assent of the intellect" to all of the teachings

of the Church I thought it best to become openly a non-Catholic and leave her fold, which I did when I thought I could expediently do so.

As to which Protestant Church one should identify oneself with, should the reader of this work be a Catholic, and the reading of it should lead him or her out of the Roman Catholic Church, I will not designate any certain one but will leave that to the reader's own choosing. But any church that takes the Bible and the life of Christ, rather than a piece of blessed bread, for its "bread of life," and which does not pray to or invoke one who "is only a creature," "infinitely less than God," comes nearer, very much nearer, having the truth than a church that takes a piece of blessed bread, the Eucharist, for its "bread of life," and which invokes and prays to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, finite glorified beings.

In one of the quotations we saw that "every one is obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to become a member of the Catholic Church," etc. In one sense of the word that would mean that we must accept and believe on the "authority" of the Catholic Church that which the "arms of the intellect" might contradict and prevent us from accepting and believing. Will God then condemn to "eternal damnation," hell, those who can not believe on Catholic Church authority that which the "arms of the intellect" contradicts and prevents them from believing and from giving to it "an internal assent of the intellect?" Answer for yourself; but I myself do not believe He will.

One thing more and then I will end this work. There is at the present time a great deal of talk and much writing about Christian unity or the reunion of

Christendom. Here is what the Catholic Church has to say on the subject:

> The Catholic Church will never come to terms with other religious opinions and parties, as she cannot surrender the truth (Spiritual Pepper and Salt, Right Rev. Wm. Stang, D. D., p. 121).
>
> That she will make no concession nor compromise, that she will not give up one iota of dogma for the sake of peace and reunion . . . If the Church be divine, this *must* be her aspect, such must be the tone in which she speaks. To submit is to obey, not man, but God (The Invitation Heeded: Reasons for a Return to Catholic Unity, Rev. James Kent Stone, p. 117).

But by what we have seen, where we saw that virtually the two leading doctrines of the Church, not taking into consideration other "doctrines peculiar to herself," are erroneous, self-contradictory and unscriptural, then does there seem to be any probability of a "return to Catholic unity," a reunion of Christendom on the basis of Papal Supremacy, unless the people absolutely reject and "throw under the feet of faith" the very faculties, the "arms of the intellect," with which God has endowed us as well as with faith, which the Church says she will one day use in her combat with Infidelity? No. The talk and hope, then, of Christian unity, which is the prayer of both Catholics and Protestants, is entirely out of the question, is it not, unless the Catholic Church does give up not only "one iota of dogma," but a number of them that are "peculiar to herself?" Answer for yourself.

THE END.

APPENDIX.

Since the foregoing was written some matter has come to hand about which I want to say a few words. Among other things is that of Communion of children, the age at which they may now receive it. In the foregoing the statement was made that children in this country were not permitted to make their First Communion till they had reached the full age of twelve years. But that is now to be changed, for the "Sacred Congregation" has spoken since the foregoing was written. Here it is, in part:

With the approval of our illustrious Pontiff, Pope Pius X., D.Cardinal Ferrata, prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, has given to the Catholic world the following announcement as to the age at which children are allowed to receive their first holy communion:

The pages of the Gospels plainly testify to the special love which Christ showed whilst on earth to the little ones. It was His delight to be in their midst. He laid hands upon them, He embraced and blessed them, He was indignant when they repulsed His disciples and reprimanded the latter in the following words: (Quotes Mark x, 13, 16 and Matt. xviii, 3-5). Bearing this in mind, the Catholic Church from the beginning took care to bring Christ to the little ones through Eucharistic Communion, which was given even to the sucklings. This, as was prescribed in almost all the ancient rituals till the 13th century, was done at baptism. . . . But to avoid all danger, lest the children should spit out the consecrated host, the custom obtained from the beginning of giving the Holy Eucharist under the species of wine alone. The infants did not, however, receive Holy Communion only at baptism, but they frequently afterwards partook of the divine repast. For it was the custom

in many churches to give communion to the children immediately after the clergy, in others to dispense to them the small fragments left over after the communion of the adults. Later this custom became obsolete in the Latin Church [*Will the Baptism of infants also become "obsolete" some day?*], neither were children permitted to approach the holy table before the dawn of the use of reason and before having some knowledge of the august sacrament [*Did the Spirit of Truth guide the Church then, and will the same apply to the reception of Baptism one day?*] . . . According to the various customs of places and opinions of men [*I thought the Spirit of Truth, through the Pope, guided the Church?*], the age of ten years was fixed for receiving first holy communion in some places, in others fourteen years and even more were required [*The Church then was not universal in teaching and practice*], in the meanwhile forbidding all those children under the required age from receiving holy communion . . . But the worst of all is that, in some places children not yet admitted to First Holy Communion are not permitted to receive the Sacred Viaticum, even when in danger of death, and thus, dying and being buried as infants, they are not helped by the prayers of the Church [*Do infant children go to Purgatory, that they should be prayed for after their death?*] . . . Having seriously considered all these things, the Sacred Congregation on the discipline of Sacraments, at a general meeting held on the 15th of July, 1910, in order that the above mentioned abuses might be removed and the children of tender years become attached to Jesus, live His life, and obtain assistance against the dangers of corruption, has judged it opportune to lay down the following form for admitting children to first holy communion to be observed everywhere [*why not include baptism?*]:

1. The age of discretion required both for confession and communion is the time when the child begins to reason, that is about the seventh year, more or less. From this time on the obligation of satisfying the precept [*issued by the Lateran Council, in 1215*] of both confession and communion begins.

2. Both for first confession and first communion a complete and perfect knowledge of Christian doctrine is not necessary. The child will, however, be obliged to gradually learn the whole catechism according to its ability.

3. The knowledge of Christian doctrine required in children in order to be properly prepared for first holy communion [*were they not "properly prepared," then, in the primitive days of the Church?"*] is that they understand according to their capacity those mysteries of Faith which are necessary as a means of salvation [*as hearing the voice of the Spirit—John iii. 8; and of believing in the Gospel—Mark xvi. 15, 16, for the reception of Baptism?*], that they be able to distinguish the Eucharist from common and material bread. . . . These resolutions of the Eminent Fathers, the Cardinals of this Sacred Congregation, have been approved by Our Most Holy Lord, Pope Pius X [*Christ said to call "none your father upon earth"—Matt. xxiii. 9, which no doubt meant a spiritual father. Yet the Church not only calls the Pope "Holy Father," but here he is called "Our Most Holy Lord.". Is that a fulfillment of the latter part of II. Thess. ii. 4?*] in an audience given on the seventh day of the current month, and he has commanded the present decree to be edited and promulgated. . . . Given in Rome at the residence of the same Sacred Congregation on the eighth day of August, 1910.

D. Card. FERRATA, Prefect. Ph. Giustini, Secretary (Catholic Register, September 8, 1910).

By the foregoing it may be seen that up to the thirteenth century infant "sucklings" were given Communion not only once, and that at baptism, "but they frequently afterwards partook of the divine repast." At that time infant children were apparently not required "to be properly prepared" for the reception of Communion, by having a knoweldge of Christian doctrine sufficient to enable them "to distinguish the Eucharist from common and material bread," discern the body of the Lord. And no doubt it was at that time believed, too, that Communion was as indispensable to their salvation as the Church believed baptism was, otherwise she would not have administered such an "august sacrament" to them. But now all that is changed, and it is now no longer believed that Com-

munion is indispensable to the salvation of infant children, otherwise she would administer it to them as she does baptism.

The new decree says that children are now to receive their First Communion when they arrive at the age when they begin "to reason, that is about the seventh year, more or less." As for some time of the past children were not permitted to receive Communion in this country before they reached the full age of twelve years, no matter how bright and intelligent they were, then was the Church guided by the Spirit of truth in both cases, as well as when she administered Communion to "sucklings?" If so, when has the Spirit of truth changed? For the changes affected doctrinal teachings and practices, not merely discipline. Is it not plainly to be seen, then, that the Church is not guided by the Spirit of truth, as she asserts, but that she is guided by "Sacred Congregations" of fallible men? Yes. That is why she is changeable.

The changes with regard to the administering of Communion to infants and children, in the course of time, also shows that in the course of time the veneration for the Eucharist increased. That is why "in the primitive days of the Church" Communion was given to "sucklings" without requiring them to have "some knowledge of the august sacrament," and why the Eucharist was given into the hands of laymen with which to communicate themselves, as we saw.

But when in the course of time "the sacerdotal theory advanced," the veneration for the Eucharist increased and it was elevated into "a God," made "out of a piece of bread, by the words of a priest," as we saw, then Communion was no longer given to any

under the age of reason, and without being "properly prepared." And the Host was no longer given into the hands of laymen with which to communicate themselves, it then becoming, as we saw, a "mortal sin" even to touch "the sacred vessels immediately concerned with the Holy Eucharist," unless one was "at the least in deacon's orders," let alone to touch the Eucharist with the hands—it being all right to touch it with the mouth and stomach. What a changeable church! Yet she claims she never changes with regard to essentials. Who but the woefully blind can not see that she is changeable and must, therefore, be mainly a human organization or institution, guided by "Sacred Congregations" of fallible Cardinals and Popes. And the Church changes in some things about every time a new "Sacred Congregation" comes into power and wants to make a show of its "authority," just like about every new Pope, "Holy Father," "Most Holy Lord," makes a show of his "authority" by granting one or more new indulgences. And every new indulgence is a new spiritual gift, making the means of salvation more and more numerous the older the Church becomes and the more new Popes she has, thus making the Church more or less changeable from time to time.

In the announcement we saw also that Communion was given to infant children not only at baptism, but "frequently afterwards." Why was that done? Did they "chase Christ away by sin" between each Communion, when as yet they had not reached the age of reason and accountability and were, therefore, incapable of committing sin and chasing Christ away? Or did they really "consume" Him to nothingness, as they did the natural food of which they partook daily

for the nourishment of their bodies? Or did He leave them, "whole and entire," when the "species ceased because of digestion?" If so, why should His presence be affected by digestion? Think of that question again. And if he left them, then how did He abide with them, or how abide with anyone else if His presence ceases when the "species cease because of digestion?" And if Christ leaves "on the consumption of the host," then what becomes of Him or where does He go? For, as we saw, transubstantiation converts, changes, not displaces, the "whole substance of bread and wine" into the substance of the flesh and blood, or body, of Christ, thus making a new substance or being with a beginning, beginning where the substance of bread and wine end, just as a new substance or being is made when the "whole substance" of an egg is converted, changed into the substance of a chicken. Even to say that—

> Our Lord is present on our altars [or in Eucharists] by way of transubstantiation (The Mystery of the Most Holy Eucharist and Human Reason, Rev. Joseph Chiaudano, S. J., p. 18),

implies new substance that forms either a new being or adds to the size or quantity of a being already existing. The writer just quoted says further:

> This same doctrine (transubstantiation) explains why Jesus Christ, although existing in this Sacrament with His body, as He is in Heaven, that is to say, perfect, is, nevertheless, invisible to the corporeal eye (*Ibid.*, p. 18).

Now, what becomes of this newly-made substance of Christ, or His "perfect" body, if it is "imperishable and incorruptible," that is, not capable of being digested and assimilated, if it is not actually "consumed" in Communion, and its presence ceases in the

communicant when the "species have ceased because of digestion?" Think of that again! Dare to have a "curious scrutiny" to think of that again!

Or is there by transubstantiation really no new substance made or brought into existence, and which has not already existed somewhere, so that the Eucharist is after all only as a mirror that reflects the sun, it only reflecting Christ? If so, then is not the word transubstantiation a misnomer, and should the process not be called Displacement, or something else, instead of transubstantiation?

Again, how has one "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," or how is one's soul nourished by it, if one in Communion does not really and actually "consume" it, assimilate it, so that it flows in the veins of a communicant as "the blood of God?" Or is the reception of Communion only a "mystical" eating, a sham eating, like the death of Christ is in Mass, as we saw, a pretense of eating, but not a real eating after all, a case of "now you do, and now you do not," "eat the flesh of the Son of Man?"

Again, where did Christ or the Apostles teach that the presence of Christ ceases in one when the "species have ceased because of digestion?" Rather, did Christ not say that "he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him" (John 6:57)? Yes. But can that be called an abiding of Christ if He withdraws His whole and entire presence "on the consumption of the host," which is about "fifteen minutes after receiving" it, and one receives the host only weekly, monthly, quarterly or yearly, or even daily? Hardly. And did not St. Paul say that Christ, when once really received, remains till we become "reprobates" (II Cor. 13:3), that is, sinners? St. John

said practically the same (1 John 3:24; 4:12, 16). The Church, then, does not agree in her teachings with those of Christ and the Apostles, does she? No. Her teaching on the subject, then, is only self-contradictory theological "verbiage," is it not?

Again, if Christ is really not "consumed" when received in Communion, and He is then only received that He might dwell in one's heart for the time during which the Eucharist remains undestroyed "by the natural heat" of the communicant's stomach, then why not carry the Eucharist over one's heart, in a locket tied to a string around the neck, and under one's clothing, if it requires a Eucharist as a magnet to draw and hold Christ within a foot or so of a certain place? For that is about the distance of the heart from the stomach into which the Eucharist goes when received in Communion. In that way Christ would remain in one's heart till He was "chased away by sin," or till the Eucharist became "stale." It is strange that His presence should also be affected by the "staleness" of the "species."

But it may be said that Christ declared He must be eat with the mouth. But what is the need of eating Him if His body is not assimilated as other things are that are eat with the mouth, if He is received into the mouth only that He might go from it through the stomach into one's heart for "about fifteen minutes?" For no thrill is felt anyway during those fifteen minutes, nor any time after that space of time, so that He might as well be carried in a locket as just stated, instead of being received into the stomach. And does He keep an eye on the Eucharist in the stomach because He is supposed to leave one when it has "ceased because of digestion?" Yet that

is what He would have to do were His presence limited by the duration of the host. How absurd that would be.

And is that the way to reach the heart spiritually through the mouth and stomach? And do things leave the heart through the stomach and mouth? Are evil thoughts of the heart driven out through the stomach and mouth? No. Must not, then, the blindness be certainly very great that can not see the erroneous and unscriptural teachings of the Church with regard to the doctrine of the Real Presence, her interpretation of John 6th, and of how she would have us "put on Christ," etc., which is, as we saw, "by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table?" And may it not be seen, then, that the way to "put on Christ," His "spirit and life," scripturally expressed by to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man," etc., is "by the hearing of faith," a mental operation of the mind and will, and not by a mouth-eating act? In that way He would also continuously "abide" with one till "chased away by sin," till one became a "reprobate," and not "abide" only for "about fifteen minutes" once a week, or month, or whenever one went to Communion. Is that not so? And if so, then would it not be much better for the Church to teach the people that, because it is plain and comprehensible, than to teach them that "Christ is not put on except by the frequentation of the Eucharistic table," as we saw the late Pope Leo XIII. taught, and that His presence ceases when the "species have ceased because of digestion," which is about "fifteen minutes after receiving" Communion? And teach them that Communion is only a function at which one partakes of simply blessed bread and wine by which to remember Christ in a special manner, "to

show forth His death, until He come?" If she did that, then there would be a possibility and a hope of the reunion of Christendom, a Christian unity of all believing Christians, which is imperatively needed if the prevalent growth of irreligion and religious infidelity is to be checked, and Christ's prayer and wish might then be brought to pass—

That they all may be one (John 17:21).

INDEX

AGE, none so dark for introduction of a new doctrine, 251.

ALTARS, why three in most churches, 290.

APOSTLES, received Christ under each form, 21. Puzzled as to which Christ to adore, 28. Where change opinion, 55. Misled, deceived, 55. Had sensuous views of religion, 123. Wrongly understood the prophecies, 126. Took Luke 22:29 literally, 126. Creed of, necessary to believe, 153. Creed of, a complete summary of Catholic doctrine, 153. If believed in Real Presence have incorporated it in Creed, 154. Declared all the counsel of God, 154. All commands of Christ to, descend upon us, 295. Not believe in invoking Blessed Virgin, 297. Where teach Christ's presence cease, 314.

AUTHOR, once blind and thoughtless, 29. Nervous system in morbid condition, 33. Be Catholic to-day if been healed by priest, 47, 277. A deluded religio-maniac, 125. Not an ex-priest, 171. Ignorant and illiterate, 237. Born, bred a Catholic, 257. Had too much time to think, 257. Led out of the Church step by step, 259. The kind of Catholic once was, 259. Left Church when expedient, 306.

BAPTISM, necessary for infants a day old, 73. Text for, 73. Of infants matter of discipline, 78. Christ makes no distinction of sex or age for, 76, 80. Text should read, from a day old on up, 81. As much warrant of Scripture for frequent, as for Communion, 87. Text for, of universal application, 88. Can be received but once, 94. How apostates re-enter Church without re-, 95. Be then received also annually, 97. Received frequently, take water of life, freely, 109. Samaritan woman told of different way to receive, 109.

BARABBAS, people persuaded to ask for, by their superiors, 255.

BENEDICTION, Christ blesses in, 193. Doctrine falls with Real Presence, 218. Display of candles meaningless at, 218.

BISHOP, goes South for health, 275.

BLASPHEMER, to be put to death, 250.

BLESSED SACRAMENT, laid on hands of laymen, 146. Christ has burning thirst be honored in, 179. Foster devotion to, by

devices, 180. Hours of adoration before, recorded on postal cards, 181. Jesus lonely in, 184. Magnetism about, that draws, 189.

Blessed Virgin, worship of, essential part, v. Church exhorts to invoke, v. Beg, take possession of heart, 57. Takes possession of heart without a Eucharist, 230. Nothing against honoring, 263. Is only a creature, 263. Is infinitely less than God, 264. Most highly honored, 264. Over forty-six thousand petitions addressed to, every second, 267. Prayers in many languages simultaneously to, 268. Priest believes can get help from, as from his mother, 268. Made our Mother in person of St. John, 269. Has arm around us from birth, 269. Likes to see Scapular worn, 269. Lets lineman fall to death, 270. Not protect against devil, 270. Not give temporal nor spiritual protection, 271. Comes to us at hour of death, 271. Personally conducts soul to Paradise, 271. Not be at two places at same time, 271. Welcomes us home in Heaven, 271. Prayers to, during Lent far greater than forty-six thousand, 272. Answers to prayers to, mere coincidences, 273. Returns thanks to, for temporal favor, 273. Infirmities yield without delay to name of, 274. Heals horse of blood poisoning, 274. Has incomparable influence with God, 279, 282. Sees our prayers in mirror of Trinity, 281. Power to hear prayer not imply omnipresence, 281. Can accede to request three thousand miles away, 281. God reveals our prayers to, 281. Not save babes at birth, 282. Get God to change His will, 283. Have to be as omnipotent as God, 285. If world Catholic, be 460,000 petitions every second to, 285. Statue of, carried in procession, 288. Not see procession of May Devotions, 289. Altars for special worship of, 290. How worship of, originated, 290. Powers of, surpass those of Isis, 290. Statues of, before which pray to, 291. Texts for worship of, 291. Why at cross, 292. Words of Christ to, only a filial arrangement with St. John, 293, 296. Behold thy mother, not addressed to people at large, 295. Christ should then have said, Behold thy daughters, 296. Competitor for prerogatives of God, 297. Wants sinners to return to her, 297. Called Mother of Mercy, 297. Never left one unaided, 298. Error of doctrine sufficient to make one a non-Catholic, 299.

Blood, daily washed in precious, 196. Of Christ be a stronger alkaloid on soul than wine, 209. Wash souls here in, of the Lamb, 215.

Book, not author himself, 26. Not a conscious entity, 26, 28. Not eat, to assimilate its contents, 27. Not be eaten by St. John, 69. Three ways to eat a, 136. Eaten in vision, 140. Of ex-priest read with doubt, 234.

Bread, of sincerity not of natural form, 98. Living, which came down from Heaven, 101. Christ selected, because most common, 105. Living, and living water the same thing, 117.

Bread and Wine, no longer on altar, 3. Substances of, annihilated, 3. Changed into Lord's Body, 4. No, whatsoever remain, 4. Become again what appear to be, 36. Be thou persuaded are something else though taste remain, 48.

Bread of Life, not of literal form, 99. The teachings of Christ, 100. Gospel and life of Christ the, 139. Give powerful dose of, 167.

Cannibalism, Catholic Communion is, 47, 173. Be guilty of, must eat flesh in natural state, 48. To eyes of faith, 54, 56.

Cardinals, if left Church influence few, 162. Italians mostly, 163. Appointed by the Pope, 163.

Catacombs, Mural decorations of, full of doctrine of Real Presence, 239.

Catholic—s, prostrate before Eucharist, 28. Leaves Church on death of wife, 45. Writers, not agree, 126. Eat their God, 157. Writers on morals of, 159. Lived most corrupt lives, 160. Now live lives high moral standard, 164, 165. Fear criticism of conduct by Protestants, 164. Not take troubles to Eucharistic God, 175. Not blessed much with world's goods, 176. Gladly spend hard-earned money for places for God, 176. Village invests total in cathedral would double home comforts, 185. Some not believe in Real Presence, 202. Buried from Church not believe all, 202. Deny single article cease be, 203. Must accept or reject all, 203. Crops and hogs of, suffer and die, 216. Most inveterate liars, 223. Contemptible hypocrites, 223. Go to Communion and theatre on Sunday, 224. Would now live lives as did at Reformation if depended on Sacraments to impel, 225. Pay to have sins pardoned, 231. Can commit any crime, 232. Must make restitution, 232. Must restore ill-gotten goods, 232. Two hundred and fifty million, in world, 265. Sin so much, go to Confession monthly, 270. Taught from childhood, only Church of Christ, 300. No right ask God to reveal truth, 303. Not speculatively question his religion, 303.

Celibacy, vow of, made by Clerics, 169.

Chalice, of Lord, of devils, 151.

Chewing Gum, not say eat it, 12, 14.

Chicken, begins where egg ceases, 5. Which first, egg or, 15.

Children, what becomes of, die without Communion, 72. Not given Communion before 12 years old, 72. Not have everlasting life without Communion, 74. Communion protects, from Satan, 78. Can sin at seven years, 78. Not discern body of Lord hence excluded from Communion, 79. No better after First Communion, 171. Fulfill duties of Christian life, 226. Not receive Viaticum not helped by prayers of Church, 309. May now go to Communion at about seven years, 309. Not properly prepared for First Communion in primitive

days, 310. Must now be able to distinguish Eucharist from common bread, 310.

CHRIST-GOD, present as long as species remain, 1. Remains till natural heat destroys species, 2. Beg, to abide all day, 2. Present about fifteen minutes, 2. What then becomes of, 3. Ego with mind in Eucharist, 4. Then not consumed, 6. Body of, glorified, 6. Declarations of, misleading, 7, 8. Not speak figuratively proven by repetitions, 7. Presence of, governed by digestion, 10. Assimilated to nothingness, 11. Why more than one reception of, if not consumed, 13. Ever eaten, not consumed, 14. Whole and entire under each form, 14. Remains till chased away by sin, 15. One present, sufficient, 16. Veins full of blood, 20. Power to change bread not questioned, 20. Communicates Himself at Last Supper, 21. Word of Father, Wisdom, Truth, 25. Nearest at Communion, 28. Dwells in hearts corporally, 29. Laymen puzzled which to adore at Communion, 29. In one's stomach, shocking thought, 30, 229. In heart, keeps eye on Eucharist in stomach, 31, 315. Dies mystical death in Mass, 36. Withdraws presence from elements not digested, 36. Mystically immolated and eaten, 37. What causes, to withdraw from Host not digested, 39. Keeps eye on Host in stomach, 39. How withdraw from elements not received, 40. Have to re-transubstantiate Himself, 40, 42. Sent disciples to preach and heal, 43. As easy to render Body present in Eucharist as heal woman, 43. Speaks by priest, 44. Suffered only a mystical crucifixion, 50. Liveth in me, meaning, 51, 60. What conception have of, in Communion, 51. Present with raiment, shoes, 52. Clothes of, how spiritualized, 52. Flesh of, be carnal to eyes of faith, 53. Spoke and forgave as man, not in Heaven, but on earth, 53. Not say, May know that Son of God, 53. Spoke as man in John 6:54, 54. Had in mind glorified Body, 54. Present in Eucharist as glorified spirit, 55. Speaking to Protestant before Judgment-seat, 55. Conception of, mystical one, 57. Received spiritually by faith, 57, 58. Formed in us by continuous consciousness, 59. Not mean literal flesh, but spirit and life, 60. Rested on your tongue, 63. Enters our mouths, 63. Spoke as man when said, This is My body, 65. Crucifying again to themselves, 68. Eat to taste if is sweet, 69. How have spoken had, used modern-day language, 70. Had in mind those at about adult age, 76. Adheres to sacred linens, 83. Soaked in water of washtub, 83. Uses third person in quotation on Baptism, 90. Person used by, makes no difference, 90. Addressed laymen in John 6, 95. I am the bread of life, 98. Spoke of Baptism to Samaritan woman, 103. No bread before, when spoke of bread of life, 106. Water before, when spoke of living water, 106. Goes from stomach to heart without Eucharist, 111. Can go where Satan can without material channel, 112. Open door to, not mean open mouth, 114. Allowed Jews to de-

part, 122. Not use words to deceive greater number, 122. Came to abolish idolatry, 122, 124. Reign in hearts as spiritual King, 122. Not explain prophecies to Jews, 122. Not set Jews aright before Pilate, 124. A deluded religio-maniac, 125. No longer speak in parables, 127. Discourses about betrayal at Last Supper, 128. Not say, Do this may have everlasting life, 128. One present, sufficient, 133. Lover of souls, 134. How we dwell in, 134. Body of, has qualities of spirit, 137. The door, vine, 139. Took whole body to Heaven, not suffer it to be consumed, 144. Would have contradicted Himself with regard to His flesh, 148. How escape censure if let Church fall into error, 152. Abiding in us lulls to sleep law of our flesh, 166. In Eucharist in person, 172. Dwells in Tabernacles as we in houses, 173. Delights to be with children of men, 173. Not leave us orphans, 173. Calls to us in Eucharist, 173. King of kings, 173. Listens in Tabernacle to all we tell Him, 174. Answers child from Tabernacle, 174. If visit, in Eucharist hear His voice, 174. Consoling to have, in Eucharist say, Thy sins are forgiven, 175. Wishes to be treated in Eucharist as a king in royal palace, 179. If any man love, 179. Comes down from Heaven every day, 183. Left altar to enter glory, 183. Remains perpetually in churches, 183. Descends on altar at consecration, 183. How spend nights alone in churches, 184. Lonely in daytime in churches, 184. Carry, with us, 189. Inanimate in Eucharist, 190. Inanimate, useless, 191, 206. Used persuasion, 195. Language in visions of Saints so different used on earth, 200. Presence of, in species should preserve from staleness, 209. Blood of, no longer be really separated from Body, 211. Be remembered without eating Him, 218. Must be manducation of real Body of, 219. Put on by frequentation of Eucharistic table, 219. Baptized in, have put on, 220. Not have spirit of, not His, 222. Put on, means have His character and spirit, 227. Not get drunk, was not envious, 227. Take possession of heart without Eucharist, 230. Able to preserve from sin, 236. An inanimate, cannot preserve Church from error, 236. Contemplate, as in Heaven, only give us hope, 237. Teachings of, in Scriptures, 237. Not teach as Scribes and Pharisees, 256. Why presence of, be affected by digestion, 313. Present on altars by way of transubstantiation, 313. Where teach presence cease when species cease, 314. Carry in locket over heart, 315. What need of eating, if not assimilated, 315. Put on by hearing of faith, 316.

CHRISTIAN, live a good, for twenty-four hours, 194.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, why healers fail to heal, 133. Founder of, passed on, 248. Church now without infallible guide, 248. Author treated by twelve healers, left in worse physical condition, 260. Tried as a last hope, 261. Sick finally get well without, 274.

Christian Unity, Church not give up one iota of dogma for sake of, 307. No possibility of, on basis of Papal Supremacy, 307. Needed to check growth of irreligion, 317.

Church—es, kingdom of God, 86. Fitting dwelling places for God, 176. Tent of God of Eucharist, 183. With which Protestant, identify self leave to reader's choosing, 306. Any, not take Eucharist for bread of life nearer the truth than one that does, 306.

Church, Catholic, not take expression of Christ in literal sense, 9. Not agree with Catholic professor, 32. Cannot cite Matt. 16:19, 77. Changeable, 82. Be death-blow claim of infallibility, 82. Not guided by Holy Spirit, in primitive days, 84. Ceased teach doctrine previously held, 84, 93. Bewitched as Galatians were, 114. Of senseless, 114. Alone claims prerogative of infallibility, 127. Ministers of, speak as having authority, 127. Faithful not question veracity of, 127. Departed from teachings of Apostles, 153. Has forgotten Gal. 1:8, 180. What the, promulgates is what Apostles preached, 182. Contradictory in teaching as to where God may be, 183. Not the only true, of Christ, 206. Voice of, voice of God, 219. Not the, of St. Paul's day, 221, 222. Gives safe guidance, 225. If erred then Christ lied, and be to deny Divinity of Christ, 234. How become corrupt with abiding presence of Christ, 235. Looks to Eucharist for her Christ, 237. With wisdom of ages knows more than you, 248. Presumptuous put one's ignorance against wisdom of Church, 248. Not change one iota in anything, 248. If failed in one point how be certainty in other doctrines, 257. Would have us beware of curious scrutiny, 258. Forbids liberty of thought, 258. Every one obliged to become member of, 300. Must submit to her authority, 300. Author not ask God if, was the true, 301. Lord laid on all docility to teachings of, 303. God not condemn to hell not believe on authority of, what intellect prevents from believing, 306. Never come to terms with other religions, 307. Will not give up one iota of dogma for sake of reunion, 307. Guided by Sacred Congregations of fallible men, 311. Mainly a human organization, 312. Changes about every time a new Sacred Congregation comes into power, 312. Not agree with Christ and Apostles, 315.

Church, Jewish, fallen down, 121. Covenants of, for ever, 121. Fell into idolatry, 124. Led into error, 254. Teaching body of, infallible, 255. If could preach error God responsible, 255.

Clerics (See also Priests), receive three or six Christs on Christmas, 14, 17. Abuses among, denounced, 160. Quite a few sick, 186.

Clocks, in Heaven, 283.

Communion, listen to Christ in, 28. Not be received if is danger of vomiting, 30. Spitting be avoided for half an hour after receiving, 31. Feed upon blessed body of Jesus in,

34. Blood of God flows in veins after, 34. No bread and wine received in, 41. Holy of Holies, 48. True flesh received in, 48. Receive in, same Christ born of Virgin Mary, 51. Touchest and eatest Christ in, 52. Remain in devotion fifteen minutes after, 62. God forms with us one body in, 63. Necessary for infants, 74. For all without regard to age or sex, 77. Never be saved without, 78, 131. Text should read, from twelve years old on up, 81. No warrant for more than once receive, 94. John 6:54 warrants annual, 96. Sows in body seeds of immortality, 132. Given in hands of laymen at one time, 146. Preserves from mortal sin, 158. Changes degraded into angels of chastity, 158. Can persevere on way of commandments with, 159. Changes man into same substance as God, 159. Christ transforms us into Himself in, 160. Fruits of, not depend on own efforts, 167. Gives strength to fight Christ's battles, 167. Remedy against concupiscence, 167. Represses the passions, 167. Meaning of spiritual, 181. Prevents and cures sickness, 185. Be given by God whatever ask for in, 186. Unworthy, cause of sickness, 187. At three special periods, 188. Enjoined by law once a year, 188. Gives foretaste of heavenly delights, 188. The oftener received the more hungered for, 188. No thrill felt at, 189, 224. Yearly, be without salvation if killed forty-eight hours after, 194. Ask for daily, in Lord's Prayer, 196. Go to, as often as obedience permits, 197. Go when have craving for, 198. Go daily because sin daily, 199. Daily, implies flesh of God not imperishable, 200. Only go to, when have chased Christ away by sin, 201. Wine creates abnormal appetite for liquor, 209. Christ's soul compenetrates our soul in, 210. Antidote against relapse into sin, 226. Fast from midnight of day go to, 228. Not go to, if inadvertently take a crumb, 228. Only a mystical eating, 314.

CONFESSION, restrains from sin more than all else, 171. Keeps from doing things otherwise would do, 171. Why did not prevent corruption of morals, 172. Greatest bulwark against wickedness, 172. No need then of going to, to a priest, 172.

CONFESSOR, judge in case how often go to Communion, 196. With permission of, go to Jesus as often as possible, 198. No longer has corner on Communion, 199. Father, I just chased Christ away by sin, 201.

CONFIRMATION, administered to infants in third century, 93. Now not given till after First Communion, 93. Effects of, 168.

COUNCIL—S, decrees of, be ratified by Pope, 240. Jewish Church held Grand, 245. Decisions of, consolatory to heart, 246. General, defined Real Presence, 254.

COUNCIL OF TRENT, great reforming tribunal, 159. Would have Eucharist received for daily faults, 199. Anathema who denies Real Presence, 245.

CREED, why write a long, 155.

DANIEL, proved dragon not god, 157.

DEATH, kind Christ dies no more, 36. Of actor on stage mystical, 37. Mystical, of Christ a sham, 37, 314.

DEVIL, instigator of all sin, 270. Put doubts into author's mind, 270. Does God let, answer our prayers, 303.

DIGESTIVE ORGANS, in abnormal condition, 36, 39. Christ's presence governed by, 40, 42.

DISCIPLINE, Communion of infants a matter of, 78. Laxity of, invaded sanctuary, 160.

DISCIPLINE OF THE SECRET, forbade Real Presence be openly taught, 154.

DOCTRINE—S, may be developed, but not altered, 84. That fall with Real Presence, 211. Pestiferous, 248. True because of universal belief, 250. To introduce a new, requires more ingenuity, 251. Of final penitence, 252. Conviction are errors not come without mental perturbation, 300.

DRINK YE ALL OF IT, limited to Clerics, 295. Not limited to Apostles by express words, 295.

EASTER, obligation has latitude of three months, 193. All obliged put on Christ at, 223. Scene of sin renewed two weeks after, 223.

EAT, the book means diligent attention, 69. Christ means assimilate with mind His spirit and life, 69, 141. To believe is to, Christ, 117.

EGG, a better analogy, 4. Changed into chicken, 4. Shell no longer veil of chicken, 207.

EGO—S, of man and woman not merge into one, 17. Of Christ in Eucharist a conscious entity, 112. Indivisible without being destroyed, 149.

EUCHARIST, HOST, body and blood of Christ, iv. Central dogma of Church, iv. Focus of Divine love, iv. Keystone of worship, iv. Very soul of Church, v. Magnet that draws Lord, 6, 31. For frequent nourishment of soul, 13. Only reflection of God, 22. God of concrete reality, 23. Christ with separate ego in, 24. God present with human nature in, 25. A conscious entity, 26. Living God, 30, 176. Washed down throat with water, 30. Not keep in mouth till dissolved, 31. Miracle surpassing all others, 46. Flesh of your flesh, 47. Same body in which Jesus suffered, 48. Same blood that trickled from cross, 50. Christ as present in, as of old, 52. Both a sacrament and sacrifice, 95. Fountain of living waters, 103. Called Bread of Life because made of bread, 104. Of tremendous importance, 127. Promised in John 6, 128. Not a perishable gift, 131. Compared with manna, 131. Sows in body seeds of immortality, 132. Not be touched except with mouth, 147. Of pagan origin, 156. Adored as God in Mass, 157. Proofs is not Supernatural, 158, 165, 171, 185, 187, 205,

209, 226. Only a piece of blessed bread, 161. Secures for us abiding presence of Christ, 173. Light kept burning before, 184. To receive, is to co-operate with, 204. Renewed every eight or ten days, 206. Becomes stale, 206. World be empty without, 237. Buried with dead, 239. Veneration of, increased in time, 311. Christ perfect in, as in Heaven, 313. Only as a mirror, reflecting Christ, 314. Carry in locket over heart, 313. Holds Christ within foot of a certain place, 315.

EUCHARISTIC PROPAGANDA, begun, 181.

EUROPE, religion Catholic time Luther was born, 161.

EX-PRIEST, tells bare-faced lies in his book, 232. Book of, abounds with unsavory rot, 233.

FAITH, exercise of, a mental act, 60. Catholic, sound but how dead, 224. Temporal good not obtained without renouncing, 261.

FATHER—S, Jewish, who died in desert, dead for ever, 130. Church, were no more infallible than Leo XIII., 239, 240. Church, may have become bewitched, 242. St. Paul an early Church, 243. Christ said, Call none on earth your, 310.

FLESH, bought in shambles, 8, 53. Of Son of Man, how eaten if not consumed, 38. Of Lord in Communion same as was formed from His mother, 47. Of Christ be carnal to eyes of faith, 53, 56. Eat, in figurative sense do some injury, 136. Eat, has three meanings, 136. Eat My, not taken in literal sense after all, 137. Profiteth nothing, 143. Of Columbus profiteth us, 148. Who are in the, not please God, 149. Of Jesus keeps down rebellion of our flesh, 166. Of God not substantial, 200.

FLESH AND BLOOD, carnal as water in Baptism, 7. How comply with precept if are no, of Christ, 68.

FIRST FRIDAY, communicate on, of each month, 197. More applicable on, than on other days, 200. Not die without final penitence if communicate on, of nine consecutive months, 252.

FOOD, natural, a temporary substance, 13.

GALATIANS, bewitched, 242.

GALILEO, forced Pope send affair before Inquisition, 246. Pope condemns, do penance, 251.

GOD, changes food into His body, 4. Has no wasting tissues, 5. Eating Himself, 21. But one, illustrated by sieve, 22. Not be compressed into wafer, 23, 26. Then be circumscribed, 26. As universal as gravitation, 26. Goes into stomach, 30. Carried in handbag, 30. Keeps eye on Eucharist in stomach, 31. In stomach, shocking thought, 32. If in heart, vomiting make no difference, 32. Everywhere wholly present, 33. Not made by hands, 33. What mutilates, in Communion, 34. Blood of, flows in our veins, 34. Cannot make another, like Himself,

46. Abideth in us if we love one another, 59. In us till chased away by sin, 59. Word, substituted for "it," 61. Do not chew, 62. If not go into stomach not receive Sacrament, 62. Children eat, for first time, 63. Divided asunder, 149. Our food, 158. Dwelleth not in houses, 177. Not pay in niggardly way, 186. If not will of, get well why use medicine, 187. Placed in man's breast craving for union, 189. Flesh of, as eternal as I AM, 201. Concrete reality in one's stomach, 230. Cannot create being equal to Himself, 267. Not will of, be cured, 279. Not give error when ask for truth, 302. Will reveal to you if otherwise minded, 304. Not require believe by faith what intellect contradicts, 305.

GRACE, life of, conferred by Baptism, 86; by Communion, 87. Inner, not derived from Communion that preserves from sin, 172. Priceless treasure, 223.

GRAFT, common abuse among churchmen in Luther's time, 159.

HAIL MARY, prayer of ten seconds, 265.

HEART—S, make fitting dwelling places for God, 177. Not reached spiritually through mouth, 316. Evil thoughts of, not driven out through stomach, 316.

HEATHENISH LIVES, for 364 days of year live well-nigh, 193, 228.

HELL, fathers in desert who ate manna in, 130. Church not teach can be prayed out of, 212. Gates of, not prevail, meaning, 235.

HIGH PRIEST—S, were infallible, 231. Scribes follow lead of, 247. When convert, believe as you do, 247.

HOLY WATER, employed in solemn services, 168. Banishes demons, 168. Purifies everything it touches, 168, 253. How made, 253.

IGNORANT AND ILLITERATE, Peter and John, 238. Thou art, dost teach the Pope, 238. Not always wrong, 238.

IMMENSE ASSEMBLAGE, best qualified judge, 245. May be in error, 246. Not make an error a truth, 247. Not make one man infallible, 247.

INDULGENCE—S, two new, 181, 217. Bishop granted, 205. Plenary, exempts sinner from Purgatory, 214. Given on deathbed, 214. Doctrine of, falls with Real Presence, 217. Not a license to sin, 217. Remits temporal punishment, 218. Every new, makes means of salvation more numerous, 312.

INFANT—S, given Communion in primitive days, 79, 308. Endowed with faith for reception of Baptism, 80. Communion as indispensable for, as Baptism, 82, 88. Communion imparted additional graces to, 92. Popes who declared Communion necessary for, 92. Given Confirmation in third century, 93. Souls of, in hell if not receive Communion, 131.

Frequently given Communion once, 308. Chase Christ away by sin, 312.

INTELLECT, give internal assent of, iv, 299. Arms of, 10, 265. Not throw under feet of faith, 18. When revolted, 262. Could no longer give internal assent of, 305.

INTERPRETATION, who knows more of proper, 241. Peter and John who knoweth not the law, 241.

IS, stands for signifies, 18, 19. Used as in this is Mary Jones, 20.

JEWS, object to doctrine as repugnant, 7, 122. Expression revolting to, shown by texts, 8. Understood were to eat flesh indeed, 8. Misled by repetition, 35, 48, 54. Had sensuous views of religion, 68. Believed Messiah be great temporal prince, 80, 250. Took sayings of Christ literally as did prophecies, 115, 120. Said, Lord give us always this bread, 116. In hell who ate manna, 131. As much people of God as Catholics are, 153. Deceived by obeying their Church, 255. God cause of their error, 255.

JOHN 6, be interpreted in spiritual sense, 64. How should read according to interpretation of the Church, 81. Refers to life of grace, 86. If not comply with, not have everlasting life, 89. As universal of application as John 3:5, 89. Binds under sin to annual Communion, 97. Treatise on Real Presence, 120. Taken in literal sense involve doctrine of immortality, 133. If admit spiritual sense of, then Church is wrong, 137.

KEY, unravels mystery, 243.

KINGDOM, of God not mean Church, 86. Not mean to Jews their Church, 121. What, is meant by Luke 22:29, 126.

LAW—S, works of, bodily operations, 114. When must go to the Sacraments, 187. Of Church contradicts her claims, 192. Of attending Mass on Sundays, 192. Of yearly Communion to prevent neglect means of salvation, 193. Contrary to free will, 195. Christ not subject to, of acidity, decay, 208. None in days of St. Paul go to Communion, 221. Christ gave complete system of, 221.

LENT, time of mortification, 164. Churches well filled in, 223.

LIE, difference between a, and an untruth, 233.

LINCOLN, be called blessed by colored people, 289. Carry statue of, in church be idolatry, 289.

LORD'S SUPPER, a memorial, 66. How be guilty partake unworthily, 67. Hypocrites bring judgment to themselves at, 68. Simply shows death of Lord, 94. Burden of discourse at institution of, 106. At institution of, Christ not say, This is the flesh I promised, 128. Not for obtaining everlasting life, 128.

LOVE, cannot bear separation, 189.

LUTHER, threw open monasteries, 159. Gave leave to monks to marry, 159.

MAN, size of person not constitute a, 80. Has craving for union with God, 189. Not need law to go see attractive young woman, 192. Some who look to a, for religious guidance, 247.

MANNA, who ate, are dead, 130, 131. A perishable gift, perishable who ate, 131.

MASS—ES, then a sham, 38, 211. No semblance to Lord's Supper, 38, 106. Not cease be agreeable to God if offered by wicked priest, 45. Not save a wife from death, 45. Laymen cannot offer up, 95. Bishop who never celebrated, 160. Not Supernatural, 161, 205. Obtains for us temporal blessings, 169. Neglect of Sunday, saddening sign, 192, 193. Not allowed be present at, 205. Real Presence indispensable to, 211. Stipends for, for special intentions, 211. The different kinds of, 211. Said for souls in Purgatory, 212. Our chief action on Purgatory, 213. Many fly from Purgatory to Paradise at every, 213. Shortens pains of Purgatory, 213. Said for departed, no matter how long dead, 215. For restoration to health, 216. Not help ailing Clerics, 216. For blessings on fruits of earth, 216. At marriages, 216.

MAY DEVOTIONS, in honor of Blessed Virgin, 288.

MEAT, eternal reward, 99. If is Eucharist, why received frequently, 100. Christ's Body as, for Apostles, 122. Kind Christ had to eat, 123.

MEDAL—S, of Lady of Victory heals horse of blood poisoning, 275. Of Saint put into drinking water cures men and cattle, 275. Four tied to string around neck, 277.

MERITS OF CHRIST, as free as air, appropriated through faith, 218.

MESSIAH, what was foretold of, 121.

METAPHORICAL, language of John 4, 107. Christ passed from, to literal speech, 119. Eat flesh, language, 136. All four texts, 139.

MIND—S, assimilating organ of soul, 71, 72, 110. Spiritual activities come by a mental act, 101. Operations of Spirit are through, 110. Evil thoughts enter through, 111. Idle, devil's workshop, 111. Spirit and life put on through, 229. Great, of Church, 237. Great, of Jewish Church, 238. Persons of great, not always right, 238.

MORALS, increasing depravity of, 159. Corruption of, in sixteenth century, 160.

MULTIPLICATION, of presence not Person of Christ, 24. Means separate egos, minds, 24.

NEWSPAPERS, age fed on, 141.

NICODEMUS, said, How can these things be done, 116, 117.

Sacraments, efficacy not depend on worthiness of minister, 45. Fountain of living waters, 102. Not Supernatural, 161. Effect inward sanctification, 165. Only make-believes, 171.

Sacred Congregation, settles how frequently may go to Communion, 197. New decree of, when children may make their First Communion, 308.

Sacred Heart, revelation, 197. Is besides what Apostles preached, 198. Thanks returned to, for favors, 273.

Sacred Vessels, sin for laymen to touch, 147, 312.

Sacred Vestments, prayer said when putting on, 169. Richness of, 177.

Sacrifice, oblation of a victim, 38.

Sacristy, part of church, Lord may be there, adhering to linens, 83.

Saint—s, Peter denies Lord, 165. Paul not teach Galatians Christ put on by Communion, 220. Ignatius disciple of John, 243. Not invoked fewer times than Blessed Virgin, 265. Not understand prayers in different languages said simultaneously, 268. God has a thousand ways make our needs known to, 281. Power to hear prayer not imply omnipresence, 281. Have to be as omnipotent as God, 285. Pray to a certain, for a certain thing, 287. Invocation of, how originated, 291. John at cross by special providence, 292. Peter not to be Supreme Pastor, 294. Paul repeatedly asks prayers of his disciples, 297.

Scapular, badge of special protection, 168, 269. Received from Blessed Virgin, 269. Blessed Virgin likes to see us wear, 269. Worn by all good Catholics, 270.

Scribes and Pharisees, great minds of Jewish Church, 238. Were infallible, 254. Not believe in Christ, say people seduced who do, 255. Blind, leaders of blind, 256. Christ not teach as, 256.

Sexual Commerce, unmarried Catholics and Protestants live without, 171.

Shrine—s, reported cures at, not true, 278. Not cured at, of St. Anne, 278. More than one, in America, 287.

Simony, a plague to the Church, 159.

Sister—s, before Eucharist made unconscious by lightning, 178. Quite a few sick, 186. Dies, spent nine years in chair, 276. Suffered something most terribly at death, 276.

Son of David, be great temporal prince, 250.

Soul, of communicant more substantial than God, 13. Needs frequent nourishment, 13. Reached and fed through mind, 71, 98, 110.

Specialist, cures patient after Novenas fail, 279.

Spirit, operations of, are through mind, 110. Hath not flesh,

137. That quickeneth, 145, 206. Received by hearing of faith, 220. Hearest His voice, 242. Fruits of, are charity, joy, 242. Do things of, reap everlasting life, 242.

Spirit and Life, not put on by eating flesh of one, 141. Of Saint how put on, 69, 70. Put on through mind and will, 229.

Spirit of Truth, Paraclete of every believer, 125, 249. Reveals only to institution with wisdom and learning, 249. When change in guiding, 311.

Substance, and accidents, meaning, 208.

Suicide, heinous crime, buried from Church, 84.

Supreme Court, renders infallible decisions, 231.

Tabernacle, no voice comes from, 30, 176. Christ always in, 174. Child raps for Jesus at, 174. Never be too richly adorned, 176. Exterior be decorated, befitting the King, 177. Christ's place of rest till eternity, 183. Throne of grace, 184.

Taste, and see Lord is sweet, 189.

Thinker, given by God, 257. Why given a, if should not think, 8.

Thirst, do such, 194. Come to Me and drink if, 195.

This is My Body, impressed sacredness upon memorial, 64. Not take in same sense as in this is Mary Jones, 64. Christ spoke as man when said, 65.

Thought, Church forbids liberty of, 258. Can follow but one train of, at a given time, 264. Eyes be opened if exercised liberty of, 280.

Transubstantiation, has analogy in nature, 4. Changes substance into pre-existing body, 6. Foreshadowed, 24. Christ present on altar by way of, 313. Word, a misnomer process be called Displacement, 314.

Truth, knowledge of, not prerogative of those only with wisdom and learning, 249. Not the, if not bear free thinking, 258. Wanted to know the, 301. Ask, seek for the, 302. Should come through the understanding, 304. Asked God to reveal the, 304.

Understanding, spiritual things should appeal to, 18. Lord give thee, in all things, 74, 302. Convictions of truth came to author through the, 304.

Universal, text of, application, 88. Doctrine true because, belief, 250.

Verbiage, some admire, 27. Only theological, 315.

Vespers, services poorly attended, 193. End usually with Benediction, 193.

Washington, George, remember at banquet without eating him, 129, 152, 218.

WATCH, stolen from house, 273. Recovered, a temporal favor, 274.

WATER, draw out of wells of salvation, 102. More a daily necessity than bread, 105. Not more natural for, to extinguish fire than Body of Christ appease heat of concupiscence, 167. Forced to drink, not have free will, 195.

WATER, LIVING, means Baptism, 103. Given thee if hadst asked for, 104. Drink, as from Jacob's well, 107. Drink, if not want to thirst again, 109. From whence hast Thou, 116. And living bread the same thing, 117. Take freely, 197.

WHY, an awkward monosyllable, 292, 294.

WILL, not impelled by Communion, 204. Impels to practice virtue, 204.

WINE, at bottom of downfalls, 170, 230.

WISDOM, eat, yet hunger, 27, 101. In multitude of counsel, 247. Ask God for, 302.

WOMAN, under certain age not be housekeeper for priest, 170. Revelation made to a, 182. Not permitted to teach in Church, 182, 198.

WOMEN, lose babes at birth, 282. Catholic, not all married or in cloisters, 287.

WORD—S, human, affords illustration, 25. Made flesh, enters soul, 25. Not speaker entire, 26. Cuts to the quick, 72. Found, did eat, 101. Sweet to palate, 102. Spiritual meaning of, slow unfoldment, 123. Summing up, of sermons impress, 224. Behold thy mother, and drink ye all of it, 294. Behold thy mother, not addressed to people at large, 295. Woman, behold thy daughters, 296. Behold thy son, of temporary nature, 296.

WRATH OF GOD, visited upon apostate Catholics, 277.

WRETCHED OUTCASTS, seek refuge in Protestantism, 261.